

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN  
JUL 10 1957  
SOCIAL SCIENCE  
LIBRARY

*Journal  
of the  
Child Welfare League  
of America  
Inc.*

HV  
741  
A21  
C18

# child welfare

Distinctive Aspects  
of Child Welfare

Community Organization  
to Meet  
Homemaker Service Need

Separating Siblings in Placement

The Replacement of Children  
from Foster Homes

No Longer "Left Out"

*July 1957*

# CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE  
CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

CHILD WELFARE is a forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

## CONTENTS

	Page
Distinctive Aspects of Child Welfare . . . . .	1
By Helen R. Hagan	
Community Organization to Meet Homemaker Service Need . . . . .	7
By Earl J. Beatt	
Separating Siblings in Placement . . . . .	14
By B. Robert Berg	
The Replacement of Children from Foster Homes . . . . .	21
By Norman Herstein	
No Longer "Left Out" . . . . .	26
By Albert J. Neely	
News from the Field . . . . .	31
Book Notes . . . . .	33
Classified Personnel Openings . . . . .	35

Editorial and general office: 345 E. 46th Street, N.Y. 17, N.Y.  
Published monthly except August and September by the  
Child Welfare League of America, Inc.  
Annual Subscription, \$4.00  
3-Year Subscription, \$10.00  
Individual Copies, 45 cents  
Student Rates—Annual Subscription, \$2.75  
2-Year Student Subscription, \$5.00

Copyright, Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 1957

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 52-4649

VOL. XXXVI

No. 7

## CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

### Officers

MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD, *Pres.*, New York, N. Y.  
FRANK S. BAYLEY, JR., *Vice-Pres.*, Seattle, Wash.  
MRS. HERBERT F. FISHER, *Vice-Pres.*, Hartford, Conn.  
REV. JOSEPH P. SPRINGOB, *Vice-Pres.*, Milwaukee, Wis.  
MRS. JUAN T. TRIPPE, *Vice-Pres.*, New York, N. Y.  
MRS. GEORGE L. WEST, *Vice-Pres.*, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
ALAN S. GEBMER, *Sec.*, Cleveland, Ohio  
THOMAS M. PETERS, *Treas.*, New York, N. Y.

### Board of Directors

JUDGE JANE M. BOLIN, New York, N. Y.  
JAMES BROWN IV, Chicago, Ill.  
MRS. ROBERT A. BROWN, Des Moines, Iowa  
MRS. SARA R. CALDWELL, Jackson, Miss.  
MRS. CLARENCE A. CHICHESTER, Piedmont, Calif.  
R. H. COLLACOTT, Cleveland, Ohio  
MRS. IRVING EDISON, St. Louis, Mo.  
JUSTICE GEORGE EDWARDS, East Lansing, Mich.  
DR. MARTHA M. ELIOT, Boston, Mass.  
CLYDE GETZ, Los Angeles, Calif.  
JOSEPH F. HAAS, Atlanta, Ga.  
W. O. HEINZE, New York, N. Y.  
MRS. KATE B. HELMS, Charlottesville, Va.  
LESLIE L. JACOBS, Dallas, Tex.  
JUDGE HARRY W. LINDEMAN, Newark, N. J.  
LEONARD W. MAYO, New York, N. Y.  
MRS. EDMOND J. MORAN, Darien, Conn.  
ROBERT M. MULFORD, Boston, Mass.  
GEORGE M. NAYLOR, JR., Boston, Mass.  
MRS. WILLIAM K. PATON, Dover, Del.  
PAUL W. PHILIPS, Fort Wayne, Ind.  
JACK N. PRITZKER, Chicago, Ill.  
EDWIN J. PUTZELL, JR., St. Louis, Mo.  
DR. JULIUS B. RICHMOND, Syracuse, N. Y.  
WILLIAM D. SCHMIDT, Cleveland, Ohio  
MRS. J. FRAZER SMITH, Memphis, Tenn.  
DR. TILLMAN M. SOGGE, Northfield, Minn.  
JOHN G. THEBAN, Washington, D. C.  
FRANKLIN W. WALLIN, Jenison, Mich.  
C. ROLLIN ZANE, Hartford, Conn.

JOSEPH H. REID, *Executive Dir.*  
HELEN R. HAGAN, *Asst. Exec. Dir.*

## COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

JOHN G. THEBAN, *Chairman*  
*Executive Secretary,*  
*Family and Child Services of Washington, D. C.*

### Policy Committee

MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER  
MR. C. ROLLIN ZANE

### Advisory Committee

THELMA K. FLOWER  
*Executive Director, Family Service Society, Akron, Ohio*  
BEATRICE E. GAUGHAN  
*General Case Supervisor, Division of Child Welfare, Department of Social Welfare, Rochester, N. Y.*  
DOROTHY GILES  
*Director, Children's Services, The New England Home for Little Wanderers, Boston, Mass.*  
KATHARINE E. GRIFFITH  
*Executive Secretary*  
*The Diocesan Bureau of Social Service, Hartford, Conn.*  
AMELIA M. IGEL  
*Director, Child Adoption Service of the State Charities Aid Association, New York, N. Y.*  
ADELAIDE KAISER  
*Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.*  
LUCILLE LAZAR  
*Personnel Director*  
*Jewish Child Care Association, New York, N. Y.*  
LUCILE LEWIS  
*Day Care Consultant*  
*State Department of Welfare, Nashville, Tenn.*  
ELIZABETH G. MEIER  
*Professor*  
*New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.*  
ROBERT F. OTT  
*Director, Division of Child Guardianship, State Department of Welfare, Boston, Mass.*  
IRVING RIMER  
*Executive Director, National Publicity Council, New York, N.Y.*  
SUSANNE SCHULZE  
*Associate Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.*  
MRS. LEE STANTON  
*Board Member, Sheltering Arms Children's Service, N.Y., N.Y.*  
VERNA WASKOWITZ  
*Division Supervisor*  
*Family and Children's Society, Baltimore, Md.*  
MRS. ALAN WIENER  
*Board Member, Association for Jewish Children of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.*

# DISTINCTIVE ASPECTS OF CHILD WELFARE\*

**Helen R. Hagan**

Assistant Executive Director  
Child Welfare League of America

*This paper represents the thinking, discussion and writing of the many individuals who have spent hours of time in the development of what is child welfare. However, the conclusions drawn are the author's.*

IN PREPARING this paper I turned to the archives of the Child Welfare League. As it should be, the League has explored the content of child welfare recurrently. In 1934, at the request of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, a committee of the League composed of board members and member agency executives began work on delineating what is specific to child welfare in the field of social work, and what special preparation the child welfare worker needs for his job.<sup>1</sup> Between 1934 and 1940 five committees, entitled "Education and Training for Child Welfare" or a variation of this theme, developed and kept this material current.

The names of League board members and others who served on these committees over the years read like the roster of "Who's Who in Social Work."

Henry Thurston was chairman of the first committee. Others were Ethel Taylor, Jacob Kepecs, Hershalt Alt, The Rev. Patrick O'Boyle, Loula Dunn, Clinton Areson, Irene Atkinson, Paul Beisser, Sophie Theis, The Rev. McEntegart, Ethel Verry and Douglas Falconer. League staff members who worked with these various committees included C. C. Carstens, Leonard Mayo, Howard Hopkirk, Sybil Foster, Spencer Crookes and Mary Keeley. Between 1946 and 1950 Henrietta L. Gordon worked with regional committees who developed a draft of a "definition of child welfare."<sup>2</sup>

\* Given at National Conference on Social Welfare, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 21, 1957.

<sup>1</sup> Prior to this in 1931 a committee had been working on this also.

<sup>2</sup> Bessie Trout, of the Children's Bureau, and Zitha Turitz, of the Child Welfare League staff, are taking major responsibility for our current project.

## Some Definitions of Child Welfare

In analyzing the reports of many different committees, one finds the same basic definition of child welfare in each. For example, in 1939 Leonard Mayo reported: "It is assumed that the field of child welfare is concerned with

- (1) those children whose status as members of their own families is threatened or lost;
- (2) with the general social forces handicapping or disqualifying parents for their child rearing function and
- (3) with the forms of care and programs designed by society to supply some substitute for the natural parent."

In summarizing the combined thinking of the League and Children's Bureau staffs in 1952 Mildred Arnold wrote:

"Child welfare is involved in the support of the parental role and in providing substitute parental care."

Mrs. Turitz defined the specific characteristics of child welfare as follows:<sup>3</sup>

"Because of the nature of the child, particularly his characteristics of immaturity and dependency, the child must have someone who is responsible for seeing that his needs are met. This responsibility is ordinarily carried by parents in our culture. The primary and unique need of the child is for parental care. Any degree of impairment of the parents' ability to provide the care which children need and are expected to receive from their parents results in a major and specific type of social problem for the child. Child welfare services are those provisions which society has made, because of its special concern for children, to deal with this problem in a variety of ways. The purpose of providing child welfare services and the role of the child welfare worker become that of assuring parental care by: (a) meeting the needs for which parents are expected to be responsible, by strengthening, supporting, supplementing and

<sup>3</sup> Discussion of "The Child Has a Family," CHILD WELFARE, May, 1957. Given at New England Regional Conference, Hartford, Conn., March 28, 1957.

restoring the parents' capacity to provide care; or when necessary by substituting for it; (b) protecting the child against further deprivations, experiences and conditions that interfere with or adversely affect his development; (c) solving or alleviating the problem of inadequate parental care through casework and other treatment services to the parent and to the child.

"Child welfare services are distinguished by the assumption or sharing of a specific kind of responsibility, ordinarily carried by parents, for seeing to it that the total needs of the child are being met; and it is assumed in proportion to the degree which the parents cannot or are not expected to carry it."

Social work is the profession that has been developed to deal with problems of the individual that result when human needs are not met adequately. Child welfare in social work deals with the problems of the child that result when the needs which parents are ordinarily expected to meet are either unmet or inadequately met.

The distinctive aspects of child welfare stem from the nature of the child, the kind of problem with which it deals, its purpose, and the unique responsibility, given it by society, which must be assumed for children.

To assure adequate parental care the child welfare agency must always, to a greater or lesser degree, assume some parental responsibility for the child.

The services provided by child welfare, which supplement, strengthen, and support the own parents' ability and capacity to provide parental care, include:

family and group day care, casework service to children in their own homes and protective service, homemaker service to enable parents to continue parental responsibility for their children, services to unmarried mothers in helping them to make a decision regarding the care and/or relinquishment of their child, counseling service to parents when the disturbed parent-child relationship interferes with the parents' ability to function fully as parents, and financial assistance to parents when it enables them to provide care for the child in his own home, such as the ADC program.

Child welfare services which substitute for parental care either partially or wholly include foster family care, institutional care and adoption.

Child welfare services may be and frequently are provided in settings other than child welfare agencies. For example, home-

maker service is frequently provided by a family agency. It may be used for the aged, the chronically ill, and also for children. When it is provided to enable parents to continue the care of their children, it is a child welfare service. Similarly, when a family agency provides casework service to parents to alleviate those problems that are interfering with the parents' capacity to meet their children's needs, this can be called a child welfare service.

### **Caseworker's Qualifications**

To discharge the responsibilities inherent in child welfare, a worker must have a special body of knowledge and a group of skills and techniques. This does not mean that workers in other fields of social work should not also have this knowledge, but for the child welfare worker it is particularly essential. When or where this knowledge and these skills should be acquired—whether it should be in the content of the school's courses, in the field placement, a combination of these, or whether it must wait for in-service training during the first year or two of employment—is as yet an unresolved question.

The child welfare worker must know the particular culture of the child, his interests, his ways of communicating, the importance to him of play and how this changes with the various stages of development.

He has to be able to relate to the infant, the pre-school child, the school-age youngster, and the adolescent and be able to shift his role with the child in accordance with the need for this. He must know the specific developmental differences of boys and girls, and have awareness of the super sensitivity of children, their radar-like ability to take from the atmosphere feeling tones of which most adults are unaware. The child welfare worker needs to know how to interpret the specific symptomatic behavior of children, how to understand their nonverbal ways of communicating and how to communicate with them without words when they are too young or too unrelated for speech.

Awareness of a child's growth as a con-



tinuum in which he incorporates his daily experiences is another must.

Walt Whitman said this much better:<sup>4</sup>

"There was a child went forth every day  
And the first object he look'd upon, that object he  
became,  
And that object became part of him for the day or a  
certain part of the day,  
Or for many years or stretching cycles of years."

Both children and adults must inevitably experience separation from those to whom they have been close, so all social workers need to know the effects of separation. However, when substitute care must be provided because parents cannot meet the needs of their children, a special problem of separation arises. Besides feelings of loss, rejection, frustration, and anger that a social worker must know how to deal with in the adult, there are additional feelings in the child who is separated from parents—his fears, bewilderment, and sometimes even his loss of identity. These stem from the child's unique relationship to adults upon whom he is so psychologically and physically dependent. The child welfare worker must be well versed in the dynamics of parent-child separation so that he knows how to anticipate it and prepare the child and parent for it in such a way as to minimize, insofar as possible, the trauma of it. He must be able to recognize symptomatic behavior resulting from separation, and help parents and children develop awareness of it.

The child welfare worker must also understand the feeling of difference which children living away from their own parents experience and how this may interfere with their ability to relate naturally to other children and to foster parents. They must also understand the ambivalence it may generate towards their own parents.

Before a student decides on child welfare as his field of social work he should "know in his bones and muscles" the distinctive responsibility that will become his. Because of lack of this knowledge, many workers may

leave child welfare agencies after a brief experience.

### *Acting for the Child*

In training for other fields of social work, the student learns that his function is to enable the client to decide and act for himself. In child welfare, however, because of the child's immaturity and dependency and because of the protective responsibility agencies have been given for children, the worker sometimes must make decisions and take action for them. For example, in situations of extreme neglect the child welfare agency may have to make the decision regarding separation of parent and child; when a foster home is not meeting the child's needs, the decision to move him must rest with the agency. Choosing an adoptive home for a child is a major decision affecting the total life of the child.

When a young worker has not been prepared thoroughly for the type of responsibility assumed by the children's field, having to participate in such major decisions can be very confusing and anxiety producing.

Throughout its history the League has emphasized the importance of having a direct living experience in the care and guidance of children as part of the training of child welfare workers. This reflects concern that caseworkers should have more basic knowledge and understanding of the parental role. It applies to all who work with children, but perhaps even more directly to child welfare workers who must select substitute foster and adoptive parents for children. To do this one needs to know not only normal child development and normal child-parent relationships, but the particular qualities of parenthood. What is it that society expects children to receive from parents, what is there in the parent-child relationship that cannot be duplicated for the child outside of the family?

Frequently, the child welfare worker must evaluate just what a particular parent can offer his child, how much of the responsibility normally expected of parents he can carry, and how much support and supplementation

<sup>4</sup>"There Was A Child Went Forth."

are needed to insure that the child's needs are met. He must also evaluate the capacity for parenthood of individuals who apply to board or adopt children. To make these evaluations the child welfare worker must have a depth of understanding of parenthood that can only be achieved from a combination of broad knowledge about the cultural expectations of parents and repeated experience in working with the parent-child relationship.

The child welfare worker must also be able to teach others how to meet the normal dependency and developmental needs of children, and how to meet the extraordinary needs growing out of impairment of parental capacity.

Because children cannot speak and act for themselves, every child must be assured a legal guardian. The child welfare worker must know about all laws affecting children such as the laws about adoption, delinquency, child labor. Other matters he needs to know about include:

the difference between guardianship and custody, and how this relates to the agency's different responsibility for individual children; the legal responsibility parents retain when they give an agency custody of their children; the rights and responsibilities they are deprived of when a court takes guardianship or appoints the agency legal guardian; the feelings of the child and parent when parental rights are legally terminated either temporarily or permanently.

He has to learn to assume an authoritative role and work effectively as a caseworker within this role.

The child welfare worker must be able to mobilize other community resources and work within a multiplicity of relationships. For the child in foster care the worker has a relationship with the child, the parents, sometimes with other relatives, with the foster parents, and often with the school. In addition, he must work with the relationship between the own parents and/or relatives and the foster parents. For the child in an institution or day care center there are even more people involved in providing the service and with whom the child will have some degree of relationship which the caseworker

must evaluate and coordinate with the treatment plan.

### ***Reaching Child Through Other People***

Another distinctive aspect of child welfare is that the worker frequently must go through other people to achieve many of his goals for his client—the child. He works with the parents in providing service to a child in his own home, for his goal there is to enable the parent to meet those needs of his child which only a parent can meet. In the course of giving this service, the worker may deal with the parent's personal problems which interfere with his functioning effectively as a parent, but his goal is to see that the child's needs are met. Similarly, in protective service, the child welfare worker strives to preserve the child's home for him. He does this however by helping the parent change his way of behaving so that the welfare of his child is assured.

When homemaker service is in the interests of children, the worker may give no direct casework service to the child, working entirely with the parents and through the homemaker to achieve the goal—enabling the parents to continue their responsibility for their children. In working with the unmarried mother the child welfare worker helps the mother with whatever problems she must resolve in order to plan for her unborn child so that his needs will be met and his future welfare protected. In addition, the unmarried mother is often helped with her personal problems which resulted in her unmarried motherhood. However, this service to the mother, while appropriately given by a child welfare agency, is not a child welfare service unless the mother herself, is a child.

In day care the worker helps the parents to continue as many of their parental functions as are possible in view of their particular situation, which may include the need for the mother to be employed, or the illness of the mother or another member of the family. Day care teachers and other child care workers provide the direct care of the child. In family day care the caseworker works through the day care mother to meet the needs of the

child during the daytime hours when his own mother is unable to care for him. Because of his special knowledge of the effects of even temporary separation, the caseworker is able to help both the group day care teacher and the family day care mother to meet the child's extraordinary needs growing out of daily separation.

Similarly, in providing foster home or institutional care for children in need of substitute parental care, the child welfare agency provides such care through foster parents and child care staff in the institution. In these situations, however, the child welfare worker assumes more parental responsibilities than does the worker in offering services to children living with their own parents.

While the direct responsibility for the child's physical, spiritual, educational and recreational needs can be delegated to foster parents, the child welfare agency must continue to evaluate and supervise this care to make sure that it is adequate for the child's needs and to insure its continuity. A child welfare agency cannot delegate such responsibilities as:

decisions regarding the termination of placement, the timing of elective surgery, a change in the child's school plan, his need for special services such as psychiatric care, and visiting arrangements with parents and relatives.

All of these are examples of decisions for which the agency, through the child welfare worker retains major responsibility.

Adoption is a child welfare service in which the workers probably take the most serious responsibility. A child's whole life is determined by the choice of adoptive parents. In preparing for this kind of responsibility, child welfare workers need to know: something about genetics, anthropology, psychiatry, psychology, religion, law, gynecology, pediatrics, child development, etc. They must have specific knowledge about family relationships and a deep understanding of the meaning of children to parents, the meaning of infertility to men and women, the cultural concepts about adoption, as these apply to different racial and religious groups.

All of this knowledge cannot be obtained in a school of social work or in a field work placement. Much of it will be acquired through

repeated experiences in practice. However, to practice adoption successfully a child welfare worker needs such information in his training, just as he needs to know that adoption workers assume an even more total kind of responsibility in the lives of children than do other caseworkers.

### ***Distinctive Characteristics Clarified***

The confusion in the field regarding the distinctive kind of responsibility assumed by child welfare workers was brought into focus for me recently when I was a member of a group, composed of social workers from other fields, discussing an adoption. The case had been presented to the group by an adoption worker to show the types of families who were being rejected by that agency as adoptive parents. Members of the group were most critical of the agency's not approving a particular family for a baby and pointed out the many latent strengths the couple possessed. They also discussed the kinds of help that could have been given by the agency to make this couple more adequate so that they would have been better able to meet the child's needs. The group failed to grasp that the primary function of an adoption agency is to find the adoptive parents who can meet most adequately the needs of the children for whom the agency is responsible.

In another situation where homemaker service was an integral part of a multiple-function child welfare agency, the worker assigned to the case was experienced in homemaker service, but had never given it before as a child welfare service. In discussing the case with her supervisor the worker described the marital problems of the parents in great detail and how each parent felt about these. She also told how the marital problems had brought about the mother's incapacity and her need for homemaker service. The supervisor asked how the marital problems were affecting the children and their relationship to each parent, and how the mother's inability to give full care to her children was affecting them. The worker did not have this information. She had not discussed the children with either the parents or



the homemaker, even though the homemaker service had been provided to maintain the home for the children and to supplement the parents' care of them.

This lack of clarity, in relation to child welfare and the specific responsibilities that caseworkers must assume when dealing with problems involving some degree of incapacity of parents, has also resulted in confused administration in some multiple-service agencies. The League's field consultants are called upon sometimes to determine why workers, with case loads composed of both family and children's cases, invariably spend a disproportionate amount of time on the children's cases to the neglect of the marital counseling cases or other problems not involving child welfare. One answer to this is that marital counseling cases can wait. The couple just goes on fighting or separates or makes up, perhaps without the problem being solved, but also without serious community repercussions or without unbearable pressure upon the agency.

Problems involving children, particularly children in placement, cannot wait. If a foster home is blowing up the worker must do something about it. The foster parents are caring for the child for the agency, and if they give up the child the agency is going to have to make a new plan. If a child breaks his leg the worker has to arrange hospitalization, has to see that the own parents are notified, and get to the hospital to sign permission for anesthesia.

The infant awaiting adoption gets older daily, and our knowledge of the importance to a child of becoming a member of a permanent family as soon as possible exerts pressure on the child welfare worker to make the adoptive home study quickly. Infancy and childhood are relatively short periods in the life span. It is then that needs are most urgent and help can be most effective. A child who is truanting from school, becoming involved in petty stealing, demands the immediate attention of the worker if the youngster is to be helped before he establishes a pattern of delinquency. Therefore because of

these responsibilities, ordinarily carried by parents but which agencies giving child welfare services must sometimes take over, the child welfare cases in a mixed case load receive what seems to be undue attention.

### **Conclusion**

The specifics of child welfare in the field of social work stem from the nature of the child, his immaturity, his dependency and developmental needs, and the problems which develop when these are not met by his own family. In providing supportive, supplementary or substitute parental care, the child welfare worker needs a body of knowledge about the normal growth and developmental needs of children, what society expects from parents and the qualitative components of the parental role, and the meaning of parents to children. He must be able to evaluate and develop an individual's capacity for parenthood. He needs skill to assess the degree to which the child can tolerate having his needs met inadequately and his ability to bear separation from his parents. He must also know the possible results of a child remaining with a parent who cannot meet his needs.

The child welfare worker has to be able to communicate with and help both children and adults. To accomplish his goals for a child he must be able to work through other people and within a multiplicity of relationships. Finally, the child welfare worker must understand fully and be able to assume the distinctive responsibilities inherent in child welfare.

## **UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS** **School of Social Work**

**Urbana-Champaign and Chicago**

•  
Basic curriculum prepares for  
practice in all fields

*Scholarships and stipends available*

•  
Write for catalog



# COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION TO MEET HOMEMAKER SERVICE NEED\*

**Earl J. Beatt**

Director of Surveys and Studies  
Child Welfare League of America

*This paper explores the uses of homemaker service as a basic child welfare service, and discusses the problems of organization, administration and financing which confront agencies in practicing this program.*

HOMEMAKER service, a relative infant among social services, has been practiced in this country for approximately thirty-five years. In the past seven years twice as many agencies have added this service as had done so prior to 1950. The growth is seen in public agencies as well as in voluntary ones.

As a concept, homemaker service has moved beyond being exclusively the concern of social agencies; other kinds of home help are being provided in the health and medical care fields. Between 1955 and 1956 the number of cities providing homemaker service or other types of home help expanded from 85 to 89; the number of agencies, from 114 to 128. Today homemaker services exist in at least 31 states. Latest statistics indicate that 103 voluntary agencies and 25 public agencies provide this vital service.

Yet while we are in a period of relatively rapid growth, most of us know that there remain vast areas where the need for homemaker service is not being met. People most familiar with homemaker service feel that the recent period of growth is overshadowed by long concern over its delayed development, that widespread expansion of homemaker service has been delayed by problems of organization, administration and financing. Undoubtedly these problems have played a large part in delaying the development of effective homemaker service. However, there is another problem which must be dealt with, before problems of organization, administration and finance can be faced and met adequately. Until we can define homemaker service clearly, develop the purposes for which it is to be offered, and establish the

service in a setting related to these purposes, we will have difficulty in clarifying the other problems.

At the 1956 annual meeting of the National Committee on Homemaker Service, I was struck by the difficulty we had in discussing community and board planning in expanding homemaker service because of the lack of definition. There were innumerable differences as to its characteristics, whether it was a professional service, the purposes for which it is provided, and the setting and auspices under which it should be offered. A review of the proceedings of the National Committee for the past several years reveals the wide interpretation given to this service. In a planning conference on Homemaker Service held by the Children's Bureau in June 1956, the same variety of interpretations appeared. More recently, the Homemaker Service Committee of the Standards Project sponsored by the Child Welfare League of America has recognized the broad base upon which homemaker service has been considered, and realized that only after establishing a definition, purposes, and the appropriate setting could standards be developed.

What do we mean when we say "homemaker service?" Is it a social service? Is it a professional service? Is a housekeeper a homemaker? Aren't baby sitters and home nurses essentially homemakers? These are but a few of the common questions continually asked.

To assist child welfare agencies plan their programs to serve children effectively, the Child Welfare League views homemaker service as one of the basic services to a child in his own home.

Children's agencies are encouraged to de-

\* Given at National Conference on Social Welfare, Philadelphia, Pa., May 21, 1957.

velop this service after carefully recognizing what it is, what purposes it fulfills in meeting children's needs, where it fits into the scheme of child care, what structure shall be developed to accomplish these purposes, and what differentiated skills are required to provide it.

### ***Used As a Child Welfare Service***

This service has many uses but must be offered specifically in terms of the client to be served and the problem to be met.

While I am confining my remarks to homemaker service as a child welfare service, I am not suggesting that it is effective only as a child welfare service; however, only as we become more specific in definition and concentrate on the purposes which the service should meet, and become more exact about the skills necessary to provide it, can we move on to the broader problems of organization, administration and financing.

Homemaker service is one of several alternative services provided to children and their parents to assist the child to remain in his own home. The following definition differentiates it from other services to the child in his own home:

Homemaker service, as a social service to children, is offered by an agency to give casework help and provide the necessary direct care of children through a supervised homemaker. It makes it possible for parents to keep children in their own homes. It is offered where parents, whose ability to provide home care and guidance has been impaired by some crisis, will with this help be able to function effectively and the children will be assured a proper home. Its goal is to strengthen, support, supplement and/or restore parental capacity to care for children and to prevent the unnecessary and/or precipitous removal of children from their own homes. As in any other tangible social service, casework helps the family and children to use the homemaker's direct care constructively, and to deal better with the problem that has necessitated the service.

In the establishment of a homemaker service in an agency serving children, its purposes should be explicit. These are some of the purposes as defined by agencies today:

- 1) primarily, to enable children to receive adequate care in their own homes, and maintain parental ties;
- 2) to prevent unnecessary removal of children from the home;

- 3) to plan adequately for placement;
- 4) to enable mentally and physically ill parents to remain at home, or to benefit by hospitalization;
- 5) to re-establish homes where there has been separation, ultimately reuniting the family;
- 6) to ease stress of adjustment after a mother has returned from long hospitalization for physical or mental illness;
- 7) to help parents raise standards of care.

In a discussion of changing concepts which have broadened the use of homemaker service, Mrs. Johnson, chairman of the National Committee on Homemaker Service, made clear that we are moving beyond the traditional use of homemaker service, that of aiding families *during* family crises, by increasingly using it *before* crises develop. Mrs. Johnson has indicated that homemaker service in children's agencies has been used not only when the mother has been physically or mentally ill and absent from the home, but also when the father or the children have been physically or mentally ill, enabling the mother to carry an otherwise crushing burden. It has been used by foster care agencies at intake as a valuable aid in averting placement or sending children to unwelcoming relatives while placement plans are being considered. It is used in foster homes when the foster mother is ill or has to be away from home. Day care agencies use homemaker service when children are ill at home, to lessen the anxiety of mothers who can function best as mothers when they are able to work. There are many other ways in which homemaker service is beginning to be used. However, here it is important only to suggest that within the framework of child welfare alone there is a vast and growing need to develop community organization tools to meet this basic community need within an appropriate structure.

Many of our community studies of homemaker service have been concerned primarily with structure, without sufficient thought to the client's problems which require definition, knowledge of eligibility, and understanding of purpose before structure can be determined.

I have stressed casework in my definition to make it clear that this is a professional

service. There has been considerable questioning as to whether homemaker service is a casework service. In many of the planning committees and conferences in which homemaker programs are discussed, frequently the point is made that what really is wanted is "homemaker service without casework." Homemaker service *is* a casework service. Casework determines effectively whether this help is appropriate to keep children in their own homes, to maintain family life and prevent family disintegration where families are unable to do so without assistance. This requires a professional person. It is often said that the professional person in social work has the following three interrelated characteristics:

1. He possesses a specific body of knowledge.
2. He applies this knowledge through a set of specific skills.
3. He possesses a set of specific attitudes.<sup>1</sup>

Casework is an integral part of homemaker service not necessarily to change the family life basically, but to enable a family to continue their way of life, particularly where children are concerned when, due to some incapacity, the parents cannot provide the care they are ordinarily expected to give the children.

Once we have clarified homemaker service and identified its purposes, we must relate it to other services established for parents and children. What is our conviction about homemaker service? Is it a basic service? Is it as important as the other child welfare services in our children's agencies? Our literature abounds with such terms as "ancillary" defined by Mr. Webster as subordinate or subservient; "auxiliary" defined as assisting, supporting or supplementing; and "adjunctive" defined as an accessory of nonessential quality. While these terms may be brushed off as only semantic differences, each of them implies, and frequently reflects the thinking of those in a position to bring about change, that the service is something less

than primary, or basic. Until we believe that homemaker service is as important an alternative for care as foster home care, day care, and institutional care, only when there is conviction on the part of the workers, the administration, the agency and its board, can we plan effectively in setting up this service. Only when we consider it basic, out of our firm conviction of its worth, can we sell its effectiveness to the community.

### ***Planning for Homemaker Service***

Let us now move into the area of planning for this community need. A basic principle which agencies must believe to be eligible for Child Welfare League membership, is that "An agency has the responsibility to recognize that the quality of child welfare service is determined by cooperation among many groups, both public and private, and in fields not confined to child welfare. It follows that the child welfare agency must work actively with all groups to maintain a well coordinated community-wide child care program." As agencies are convinced of the need for homemaker service, agency leadership will be necessary for common planning to develop in a community the required homemaker program. It is natural, in communities of sufficient size, well enough organized in their social services, for the agencies and groups concerned about homemaker service to contact their local community welfare councils to request joint planning in the examination of need for and method of supplying such a service. In unorganized communities, rural areas, and cities without social planning bodies, agencies themselves should assume responsibility for planning jointly with interested civic organizations to implement such service.

In the establishment of a study committee for homemaker service as in any other study, to obtain the needed service, we must invite more than the staffs and boards of interested agencies to participate in planning. And from the beginning we should be evaluating the ways in which we can build implementation of recommendations into the development of the study. For example, a homemaker service

<sup>1</sup> Werner Boehm, "Shaping the Professional Person." Paper presented at Minnesota State Welfare Conference, March 1953.



committee of a community welfare council should include, in addition to interested agencies and their boards, representatives from the budget committees of the local financing groups; lay campaign chairmen of the local financing groups; and public officials such as county commissioners and county boards of supervisors, or city commissioners. These will play a part in decisions about financing services which may become public. The close relationship of this service to the medical field certainly would suggest having adequate medical representation on any planning body. Once a committee has been established, it stands in a position to make implementation possible, if it is convinced of the need for the service.

How can we develop our study plan to show and convince our potential implementers? There are plans which may bring to light the value of homemaker service, first, and most important, as an alternative child care service which keeps the child in his own home; and second, as a replacement for a type of foster care which has in reality been a substitute for homemaker service, due to lack of this resource. Study committees, in addition to gaining estimates from individual agencies as to the number of clients who could benefit from homemaker service, could undertake a case load review of children currently in foster homes, institutions, and day care, for a specific period of time, to determine the reasons for placement. We would have ample evidence to support our strong feeling that homemaker service might have been the more beneficial service.

I am too frequently made aware, in reading records, of the lack of specific agency-established intake criteria to determine the service which will best meet the needs of the child. Unfortunately, this is due to more than a lack of resources. It is due to a lack of clarity as to what service can be most effective in assuring children the kind of care they should have. In a number of cities I have found that a review of children in foster homes, institutions, and day care indicates that, had the agencies the benefit of a homemaker program, or had they conviction as to

its worth, many children now separated or in semi-separation from their families would not have been unnecessarily removed.

Comparisons of the length of care provided children in foster home or institutional care versus length of care of children under homemaker service, when determined by per diem cost per child, suggests strong financial advantages in homemaker service. Communities are often reluctant to develop this service when they discover that a homemaker is paid somewhere between \$45 and \$60 per week. However, an analysis of costs will show that, more often than not, the shorter length of time required in homemaker service makes this more economical than foster care. In 1954, the Children's Aid Society of New York estimated its per diem foster home cost at \$3.58, or \$1,305 per child per year, based on an average length of stay exceeding one year. This agency spent \$423,700 to serve 340 children. During this same year, CAS estimated 22 days as its average length of care for homemaker service. The per diem cost per child was \$3.99, or \$87 per child per year. Serving 563 children (223 more than in foster homes), this agency expended \$49,477, approximately one-ninth of the foster home budget.

Experience has taught us that children separated from their families, even presumably for only a short period, frequently remain in foster care much longer than originally planned. We are well aware that often separation weakens already tenuous family ties. Thus, homemaker service may not only reduce the period of time for which service is required, but also will reduce the cost to the community.

Not all children in foster homes can benefit from homemaker service. However, we should recognize that the cost of homemaker service can actually be much less for a community, and should not be considered a deterrent to establishing the service. Sound case evaluation in a study committee can document well the need and the cost, so that any community made cognizant of these is in a better position to promote this essential service.

Assuming that the need is well documented,



let us consider the question of how a community plans structurally for this service. In a review of a large number of homemaker studies in the files of United Community Funds and Councils of America and the Child Welfare League, I have found that community structural planning for homemaker service falls essentially into three areas:

1. Studies recommend that in any community each agency which offers a social service, the total effectiveness of which requires a homemaker, should have this resource as an integral part of the agency.
2. A number of communities have recommended that a separate structure, a Central Homemaker Service Agency to recruit and train homemakers and refer them to other agencies, be provided. These may or may not offer a casework intake service.
3. A sizable number of studies have recommended that homemaker service in a community should be located in an agency or agencies, depending on the size of the community, offering a multiple-service casework program. Agencies that carry homogeneous services (i.e., all children's agencies in a community) band together and place a homemaker service program in one agency for administrative purposes. One agency carries the basic responsibility for the recruiting and training of homemakers, with all the similar agencies using the homemakers. In most instances, the caseworker from the requesting agency carries the case, confers with the homemaker supervisor of the agency administering the service, and works with the homemaker to assist the family in using it effectively.

We must keep in mind the client and his problems, and purposes which lead to solving them, as well as the structure through which this is done. I fear too often our wish to expand services leads us into a study of structure, sometimes at the expense of losing sight of our clients and the varied problems which they present, and the differentiated skills necessary to meet them.

In communities where it has been suggested that each agency provide its own homemaker service, we immediately find the practical difficulty of insufficient community finances to develop a corps of homemakers in each agency. Further, in small or rural communities there has not been sufficient need to justify the establishment of this service in each agency.

A number of communities have become interested in establishing a separate or cen-

tral homemaker service. These communities contend that the development of a central service would make it more readily available to families which require homemaker service but not continuing casework service. They have stated that family and children's service agencies would be able to conserve their staff time for families requiring continuing casework service; that interpretation to the community and to those who need the service could be done more effectively; and that recruiting, training and placement could be more efficiently handled.

Any discussion of community structure for homemaker service, as for any other social service, must be predicated on the needs and problems of the family. (It may be the need for care of a sick person; it may be the concern for care of children.) This requires knowledge of the problem and the effect of the homemaker on all members of the family—mother, father, and children. Thus we must have a professional intake service which studies the problem to see what will solve it best. Implicit in the reasons for the development of centralized homemaker service is the feeling, on the part of some, that many homemaker service cases do not require casework. In one such community the proposed plan for this service contained the following statement:

"It is specified that the caseworker's responsibility at intake is to evaluate the appropriateness of the service for the client and to *ignore other problems as much as possible*, except to evaluate to what extent they might handicap the effectiveness of the homemaker service. In other words, homemaker service is not to be a tool to force or inveigle clients to make use of casework services for other problems that might be in the situation."

I cannot agree with this point of view.

### **How Casework Can Help**

I should like to differentiate homemaker service from other types of home help which could be made available to families with sufficient strengths to operate independently of any social service. In view of limited qualified staff in social agencies, and limited financial assistance provided by the community social work is not in a position to be all things to all people.

Our homemaker service, in child welfare, should be specifically related to those situations in which there is deprivation of adequate parental care. If parents are financially unable and psychologically incapable to provide the care children need, due to a situation which can be overcome through adequate casework and direct homemaker help, then homemaker service should be considered.

If parents are psychologically able, but are financially disabled either by the crisis which precipitated the need for help, or by meeting the cost of alleviating the crisis, casework determines their ability to maintain parental strengths. How else do we determine their psychological ability to maintain parental capacity to provide for children? The temporary disability of the parents requires casework, as well as the homemaker's direct care for the children. The skill of the worker will include adapting the intensity of casework to the needs of the situation. The degree of the parents' ability to carry their function will determine the intensity of casework service.

If families are financially capable and psychologically able to plan for themselves, the home help they seek should be provided outside the orbit of social service. If it is true that the large bulk of the families coming to our attention do not require "continuing casework service," as some state, then we should explore whether this clientele is best served by social service, or by another resource.

The agency best equipped to provide a total homemaker service is one with a variety of services to meet the particular problem. If the problem is how best to care for children, a multiple-service children's agency which provides the most appropriate alternative service can best offer homemaker service. In larger communities, homemaker service geared to assure parental care for children, should be provided through a children's agency prepared and equipped with the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to deal with this type of problem.

Such service may be provided in the family agency as well, provided the agency can

assume and share the required responsibility for the total well-being of the child, and has the specialized skills and understanding that develop only through repeated experience in working with this type of problem.<sup>2</sup> In our large communities, for those problems of a family service nature which require homemaker service, one family agency, administratively operating a homemaker program, should furnish its services to all family service agencies.

In the smaller communities, frequently a combined family and children's agency has been established, and would logically assume homemaker service responsibility.

The nature of the clients' problems, the effectiveness of homemaker service in meeting these problems, and the volume of clients who would profit by it point to the need for the establishment of a homemaker service in public agencies.

If we can agree that homemaker service is a casework service, then centralized homemaker service is a referral service to other agencies. Administratively, is it not sounder to provide the service the clients require in one agency? Homemaker service is not unlike other social services. We are moving away from the concept of separate or single-function services to meet only tangible needs. For example, maternity homes are combining with agencies serving unmarried mothers, or are expanding their service programs beyond domiciliary care alone, as they recognize the validity of meeting the total problem the girl presents. We do not develop centralized foster home agencies prepared only to offer recruitment and training for foster homes.

### Summary

If we have delayed in the development of homemaker service in many of our communities, we will not alleviate the block merely by suggesting community social service structural changes. Rather, our agencies and profession must be able to define this service,

<sup>2</sup> Zitha R. Turitz, *Discussion*, "The Child Has a Family," *CHILD WELFARE*, May 1957.

and develop or use settings and structure only after recognizing the specific purposes it may fulfill.

Those in the field of homemaker service, who have done yeoman work over the last decade or two, should pause, take a look at our present homemaker service program and decide exactly what homemaker service is. Can it be provided to all clients by the same training and skill, and in the same setting? Isn't it time that it becomes specifically identified, in terms of the clients served, the problems presented and the setting best suited by specific skills to meet these problems? When practitioners in the field recognize this as a basic service, can they then explain the service to the community organizers and leaders, and develop a team relationship in which content and practice can blend with the knowledge of community resources, finances, and power to interpret a most basic community service which helps children remain in their own homes?

### **New League President, Officers, Board Members**

Mrs. Richard J. Bernhard, long a leader in social welfare work, was elected President of the Child Welfare League of America at the June Board meeting. As a member of the Board and as an officer Mrs. Bernhard has served the League in many important capacities. Perhaps most far-reaching was her leadership as Chairman of the Committee on Functions.

Among her many other activities in social welfare, Mrs. Bernhard is the President of the Arthur Lehman Counseling Service and the Social Legislation Information Service. She is Treasurer of the New York State Association of Councils and Chests; a board member of the New York State Association of New Americans and of the Citizens Committee for Children of New York City.

Other new officers are Vice-Presidents: Frank S. Bayley, Jr., Seattle, Washington; Mrs. Herbert F. Fisher, Hartford, Connecticut; Rev. Joseph P. Springob, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Mrs. Juan T. Trippe, New York, New York; Mrs. George L. West, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Secretary: Alan S. Geismer, Cleveland, Ohio; Treasurer: Thomas M. Peters, New York, New York.

The League also welcomes the following new Board Members:

**R. H. Collacott**, Director of Public Relations, The Standard Oil Company, Cleve-

land, Ohio, is Vice-President, Family Service Association of Cleveland; board member, Family Service Association of America; member, Casework Council of the Welfare Federation; member, Advisory Council of Graduate School of Social Sciences of Western Reserve University.

**W. O. Heinze**, President, International Latex Corporation, New York City, is Treasurer, Playtex Park Research Institute which supports research in childhood diseases.

**Mrs. William K. Paton**, President, Children's Bureau of Delaware, is Vice-President, Delaware Council on Education; board member, United Community Fund and of PTA of Dover; member, Women's Joint Legislative Committee of Delaware; delegate to Welfare Council of Delaware.

**Paul W. Philips**, Attorney, Helmke, Philips & Beams, Fort Wayne, Indiana, is President, Family and Children's Service of Fort Wayne; Director, United Fund of Allen County; board member, Anthony Wayne Council, Boy Scouts of America; President, Fort Wayne Estate Planning Council; city attorney.

**Franklin W. Wallin**, a dairy farmer, was formerly President, Council of Social Agencies of Grand Rapids and Kent County; past President, Michigan Welfare League.

## **The George Warren Brown School of Social Work**

### **WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

St. Louis 5, Missouri

A two-year graduate curriculum leading to the professional degree.

#### **MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK**

Child Welfare is one of eight fields of specialization open to the student in the second year, following a first year of generic content. Supervised field practice afforded in both public and private agencies.

Scholarships or training grants usually available for the qualified applicant.

#### **DOCTOR OF SOCIAL WORK**

A post-graduate professional curriculum with a research orientation.

Early inquiry and application is advised.  
For information, write to The Dean.



# SEPARATING SIBLINGS IN PLACEMENT

**B. Robert Berg**

*Supervisor*

*Children's Department*

*Jewish Family and Children's Service  
Minneapolis, Minn.*

*The author believes that in many instances sound casework thinking should result in the separation of siblings placed away from their own homes.*

MANY FACTORS make it difficult to consider a plan to separate siblings. Not the least of these is the feeling on the part of both laymen and professionals that under no circumstances should brothers and sisters be separated.<sup>1</sup>

Parents requesting placement are often opposed to having the children in separate homes. Sometimes this is because of a genuine feeling that it is important for them to stay together in order to retain some semblance of the "family." Occasionally the desire is for practical reasons, such as the convenience of visiting only one place.

For many children living with a sibling is reassuring. They can have each other's support in adjusting to the loss of their own home and in getting established in the new. Having lost their own parents, there is some security in not having lost each other. These may be compelling reasons for keeping some siblings together. Unfortunately, at times in order to keep a family of children together we have to settle for less than adequate placements. Some children who obviously should be in a foster home are placed in institutions for years because no home large enough for all the youngsters in the family was available. Perhaps a foster home was used because it had sufficient room, but was really not able to satisfy the individual needs of these particular children.

In general, unless there are specific contraindications, it is desirable to try to keep children of a family together. However, whether placement together is a "must" should depend on diagnostic considerations, including:

<sup>1</sup> Callman Rawley, the Executive Director of this agency, refers to this concept of non-separation of siblings as a stereotype behind which are several assumptions, drawn as much from moral and emotional attitudes about "the family" as from clinical experience.

What is the relationship between the siblings? Do they, or can they, get support from each other? Also, do other factors in the life situation displace or have a more dynamic function in the life of each child at this time? These factors include age, probable length of placement, sibling rivalry, the depth of parental deprivation and the resultant need for individual affection and attention.

The following three cases illustrate just a few of the circumstances where it seemed in the best interests of the children to separate them.

## ***Siblings Who Are Too Inter-Dependent***

In order for a child to develop healthy interpersonal relationships, he must be able to form a satisfying dependent relationship with an adult. When the emotional involvement and investment between siblings is so great as to get in the way of this, then separation may be indicated.

The case of Judy and Jeffrey Kay is an example of this. Their parents were divorced when the children were four and two years old respectively. The father was drafted soon afterwards and sent to Korea. The mother attempted to make plans for a living arrangement whereby she could work during the day and live with the children at night. Over approximately a six-month period she and the children were in and out of a number of mutual foster homes which she found on her own.

While Mrs. Kay loved her children, her own immaturity made it difficult for her to provide any real consistency in the way she handled them. At one moment she was overwhelmingly indulgent and affectionate and at the next punitive and withholding. Consequently the children both loved and feared her. They were much more sure of each other's responses than those of their mother.

Mrs. Kay came to us in a panic because the family she and the children were living with was insisting she move out immediately. Working on the principle that the best plan for children is in a home with their own



mother, we first explored every possibility of the family staying together. However, during the intake interviews it soon became apparent that Mrs. Kay really did not want to live with her children on a full-time basis. She rejected the possibility of going on ADC. It was important to her to continue working. The consistent failures in a mutual foster home set-up (because of her own needs) made it seem unwise to try such an arrangement again. Mrs. Kay finally decided that she wanted the children to be placed in a foster home while she lived separately and worked full-time.

As Mrs. Kay was only twenty-five and attractive, her plan of soon remarrying and re-establishing a home for the children with her seemed realistic. Placement at this time was indicated in view of her inability to assume the role of a mother on a full-time basis. The treatment goal was to work with her in the direction of the family being reunited when she was more able to assume a maternal role and to help her to be prepared to assume such a role.

#### ***When Child Assumes Adult Role***

Judy, aged four and one-half, and Jeffrey, aged two and one-half, were placed in a foster home together. There was very little preparation because of the pressure on Mrs. Kay to move immediately. Both children related quickly and positively to their foster parents, who were warm people with rich experience in caring for foster children. The foster mother was first impressed and then frightened at the extreme responsibility Judy took for Jeff. Everyone seeing them together remarked about "what a regular little mother she is." As a matter of fact, this four-year-old girl was a little old lady.

The degree and kind of responsibility a child can assume should be related to his chronological age and emotional maturity. Ability to take on adult responsibilities is a result of gradual training and successful experiences in assuming responsibilities appropriate to one's age. A child's growth and development is handicapped by the imposition of too great responsibility too soon. In this case both Judy and Jeff's development were inhibited by the expectation that Judy could and should take over parental responsibility.

We became increasingly concerned with this close relationship between brother and sister. Judy was completely renouncing all the satisfactions she should be having as a

four-year-old in favor of her brother. She even gave up her favorite toys because "I'm big and Jeff is little." The relationship was not really fair to Jeff either. Being so completely cared for and mothered by his sister lessened his need for care from a real mother figure. Yet, obviously the care his sister could give him could not be adequate (no four-year-old can successfully assume a full maternal role). We attributed his slowness to this. He was able to communicate his needs to his sister in non-verbal ways and was behind in talking.

Judy's experiences with her mother had already resulted in her establishing a clear-cut pattern of relating to people in a rather limited manner. Of course, all four-and-one-half-year-olds have evolved a series of techniques of handling relationships based on their experiences with their basic family unit. Judy, however, showed little flexibility in her approach. In her home, feelings were usually black or white. Either all was manically gay and affectionate or all was violence and rejection. Judy could either be warm and loving and try to please her mother within this framework by her goodness and helpfulness, or she could be desperately unhappy and withdrawn (cry, retreat, be depressed). As an end result all of Judy's efforts went into trying to maintain the only tolerable affective atmosphere at home. She was affectionate and seductive. She did everything possible to ingratiate herself with adults and with her brother.

Daddy had little to do with the children. When he was home he was in continual conflict with his wife, who accused him of drinking and "running around with other women."

#### ***Why Judy Was So "Maternal"***

Judy developed a close and protective relationship to her brother. This seemed clearly a reaction formation. She had to repress her hostility and resentment of him because any display of these feelings would precipitate a violent attack by her mother. That Judy would have angry feelings about Jeff was clear—he took a large share of the affection when things were going well but, being

smaller, escaped much of the "bad times" so that Judy absorbed most of the punishment. Furthermore, mother could accept Jeff's taking things belonging to Judy because "he is too little to know better." Judy was big enough, she felt, to control all her own impulses. The mother was proud of how she had trained Judy to be such a "good sister." In order to please her mother and further ingratiate herself, Judy assumed considerable responsibility for Jeff's care. This served to reinforce the "nice" behavior resulting from the reaction formation, so that she was always sweet and good to Jeff.

During the initial months of placement our understanding of the dynamics behind Judy's behavior deepened. Regular office contacts with Mrs. Kay gave us a clearer picture of what the interpersonal relationships had been at home and why Judy had to be a mother to Jeff so as to win the affection of her parent. It became increasingly apparent, too, that Mrs. Kay's own needs at this time were too great to permit her to be a mother to these children.

Most of her interview time was spent on the two topics of most immediate importance to her: (1) her unhealthy relationship with her own mother, and (2) her current love affair.

In many instances judicious interference can relieve the child of inappropriate and overburdening responsibilities so that separation is not necessary. If this can't be done then separation is necessary to achieve this end.

The foster mother tried hard to help Judy feel free to be more like a little girl and reassured her that she did not have to take care of Jeff to such an extent. Judy was told directly that she would be loved just as much if she didn't do so much for Jeff. The foster mother tried to meet Jeff's needs immediately so that not even a slight delay would be possible for Judy to interpret as meaning that she was expected to step in. Judy was given much affection but not related to her helping Jeff. When she did do things for Jeff a point was made *not* to make much of it so that she would not find an approval in this area that she would need to continue to seek. In every way we tried to create a situation where no demands were made on her in relation to Jeff.

None of these approaches proved successful.

After two months of placement the foster mother was hospitalized and had an emergency operation. Her doctor felt she would need several months of convalescence before being able to resume her duties as a foster mother. As we had to move the children at this time, we decided to separate them and see if we couldn't lessen Judy's burden of responsibility in this way.

We were fortunate in having two foster homes available which were located only one block away from each other. This gave us the opportunity to place Judy and Jeff in separate homes and still have them close enough so that they could see each other frequently.

This plan was at first vigorously opposed by Mrs. Kay. However, after hearing our explanation, she agreed to it as she could see how being together was detrimental to the development of both children. We also used this time to focus with her on her part in establishing the behavior patterns necessitating separation and how she could avoid this when the children were back with her.

The results were gratifying. Instead of being upset Judy seemed to be quite relieved. She was now free to make normal demands on her foster parents without any feelings of guilt that such demands were depriving Jeff. She had the chance to be the little girl and not the little mother. Jeff was now freed to extract the full value of his foster parents, and he too began thriving.

After over one year of separation we were convinced that such a plan was definitely in the best interests of both youngsters. By the time they are reunited in their mother's home we hope that Judy will have developed a healthier pattern of behavior and no longer need to act in the way which made the separation so necessary. Furthermore, we hope that Mrs. Kay's growing understanding will eliminate the behavior on her part which helped create the problem.

### ***Siblings Who Compete for Affection***

Each individual has certain basic affectional needs. The degree to which these are expressed and can be met in placement de-

depends on the life experience in interpersonal relationships up to the time of placement. Some children have repressed these needs, others' demands seem insatiable. When the amount of affectional gratification for one child must be limited because of a sibling's needs, separate placement is indicated. In the following case, the affectional needs of each child were so great that they were forced into a situation of intense competition with each other. The principle is the same, however, when the expression of affectional need is not manifested through physical demonstrativeness.

The parents of Bobby, age six, and George, age seven, were divorced after years of intense discord and bitterness. Their hostile involvement with each other left them with very little genuine affective energy to give the boys. Soon after the divorce the father married the mother's "best friend" and moved to another state. Mrs. Smith moved in with her parents. After a year, the grandparents served notice that they would not continue to make a home for the boys and Mrs. Smith. They found the continual conflict more than they could stand. The youngsters were difficult to control and extremely demanding.

Mrs. Smith was a very demonstrative person and would hug and kiss the boys at any time. There was little real meaning in her affectional displays. They were shallow and indiscriminate. The following incident shows how love-starved Bobby was.

After placement, when the housemother commented to Bobby that he need not kiss and hug every visitor to the institution, he remarked, "Why not, my mother does?"

Most of Mrs. Smith's genuine warmth was reserved for George, and his share was considerably greater than Bobby's. Although the boys must have been aware of this preference, as it was so obvious to everyone else, neither ever verbalized it. Furthermore, Bobby was more attached to George than George was to him, and seemed to have a greater need for them to be together.

Mrs. Smith was anxious to make arrangements for the boys which would permit her to have considerable personal freedom. She hoped to remarry soon and re-establish a home. She asked that the boys be placed in a small children's institution she knew about, and stated she would rent a room in the neighborhood.

As in the previous case, placement was made because of the mother's inability to assume the maternal role on a full-time basis. The treatment plan, which we hoped would culminate in the boys being reunited with their mother, was to help Mrs. Smith (through casework contacts) to be able to assume the role of mother full-time. Mrs. Smith understood that the agency would also continue active as long as necessary after they were reunited to help them all in adjusting to a new home situation with a new father.

Because Mrs. Smith was not ready to accept a foster home at first, and as no foster home was immediately available which could take two boys, we went along with placement in the institution. Preplacement interviews with the boys revealed that they were ready to be moved. Apparently life in their grandparents' home had been sufficiently unpleasant so that they were also looking for an escape. There seemed to be remarkably little real anxiety about the move. Their indiscriminate and immediate reaching out for close relationships with all new adults served notice of pathology in relationships.

Very soon after placement we found that the affectional demands and needs of these boys were fantastically large. The institution staff members, already familiar with the needs of emotionally deprived children, were astounded and overwhelmed. The insatiable nature of the demand exhausted everyone working with the boys. They would hug and kiss the caseworker, calling him "Daddy." The cook, the maid, the resident director, the assistant housemother were all recipients of this behavior.

### ***Why These Brothers Were Separated***

Initially we felt that there was a strong element of competition between the boys for the affection of adults. However, as we looked at it closely, there seemed a different element involved than just a desire to get more loving than the other fellow. It was not that Bobby and George objected to the other one getting affection. Rather, it was that each one's need for affection was so great



that when an adult came into view they had to get it. When they were together and two adults were available at once they used both. When only one adult was present (which was more usual) they both had to receive the loving at once and then the impression was one of competition. In any event, they constantly got in each other's way and this did lead to mutual antagonism.

Bobby related to the other children in only the most superficial way—at times not seeming to be aware of their existence. He was mainly concerned with getting the attention of the closest available adult. His infantile way of relating (climbing in the lap, very close physical contact) revealed clearly his very basic emotional deprivation. What little love his mother could give went to the favored George. Bobby sought the love a baby gets, the satisfactions he had never really had.

George was as demanding as Bobby but his need was not quite so primitive. When his mother did notice him there was often some warmth. Consequently, he would strive for attention. If the adult paid attention to him he was reasonably sure that some love was directed his way. To achieve this end George resorted to a number of physical symptoms. He had difficulty seeing and had to get glasses. Actually his need for glasses was so minor that we got them for him only as an assurance of our interest and concern. He had frequent stomach aches and headaches. Occasionally his leg hurt. Our pediatrician always found him to be in excellent health. George had more communication with the other children than Bobby. However, his contacts were mostly negative. He was unable to play with them and often seemed to pick fights. His provocation seemed to serve several purposes. First, he ran to complain to adults and so attracted their attention. Second, as he always lost a fight he appeared to derive some masochistic satisfaction from these encounters. We later learned that after punishment mother would take him into bed with her.

George was generally disinterested in Bobby. He did not dislike him but seemed to

consider him rather unimportant in his scheme of things. Bobby, on the other hand, was more concerned and attached to George. We felt he tried (unsuccessfully) to get from George the warmth he did not get from his mother. In addition, it seemed that he attempted to get vicariously through George the mother's warmth. For example, when George received a gift from mother and he did not, Bobby remarked with delight how much he liked George's gift.

We felt that because of the depth of their need for individual attention and physical contact it was important to separate them. It seemed that such a move, paradoxically, was more likely to help preserve their relationship than being together where they were of necessity vying with each other for attention and affection. There was also the realistic consideration that we had no placements available where the substitute parents could handle the demands of these boys over an extended period of time. Together they were more than any average, adequate couple could cope with.

There were a number of clues in this case suggesting that the affectional needs of one might impinge on the needs of the other. One of the first of these clues was the observation that the mother favored George over Bobby. Another was the aggressiveness of the boys in seeking affection—even if it meant trampling the other fellow to get it. A whole series of clues was given by the sick manner in which the boys expressed their needs—through symptoms of physical illness, by inappropriate (for the age level) infantile behavior, by defiant behavior, by getting into difficulties elsewhere.

Mrs. Smith was quite accepting of the separation of the two boys. She tended to view their immense affectional demands as a compliment to her in that it was, to her way of thinking, a reflection of her own warm and demonstrative personality. Her complete lack of insight about their affect hunger helped us in focusing on a most important area needing work in order to achieve the goal of reuniting the family.

George was placed in a foster home while Bobby remained in the institution, with the understanding that as soon as a suitable foster home was found for him he would be moved. The boys did not seem to be upset by



the separation from each other. George requested that he be moved first. George went through an initial period of intense testing in the foster home and then made a satisfactory adjustment. Bobby continued to need much attention and affection, but the institution staff were able to provide this without feeling the strain they experienced earlier.

### **Siblings Who Are Hostile to Each Other**

A basic precept in protective work is that a child should be removed from his family when continued contact with it seems damaging—whether physically or emotionally. This applies to siblings in placement as well. Where it appears that physical and/or emotional damage will occur when siblings remain together, they should be separated. This can be illustrated by the case of David and Kenny Tallow.

These two brothers, ages eight and eleven, were referred to us by the juvenile court. The complaint before the court was breaking and entering. Although this was the first time they had appeared in court, it soon became apparent to the probation officer making the study that there was a long history of serious delinquent behavior. For several years the boys had been involved in stealing incidents, fire-setting, fire-alarm setting, and destructive behavior.

At the hearing the judge felt that the behavior was so serious that drastic action was necessary to protect the community. On the other hand he was reluctant to commit boys so young to a state school. He called upon the agency for a comprehensive study and recommendations. Because the parents were so obviously unable to help keep the boys out of difficulties, the court ruled that during the study both boys were to be placed away from home. Initial placement in this case was occasioned by the authoritative action of the court.

David and Kenny were placed in a small institution very close to their own home. The study was conducted for over three months. There were numerous conferences with the school and the local recreation agencies; comprehensive psychological testing, including TAT and Rorschach; psychiatric consultation and interviews with a psychiatrist for the parents and David; weekly interviews with both parents; weekly interviews with both boys; observations of the institution staff.

Our study revealed deep pathology. To begin with we found parents who hardly

communicated with each other. It seemed that the family unit was preserved mainly by social pressures. There was no particular conflict between the parents but each seemed to live a separate life not involving the other.

Mrs. Tallow seemed satisfied with her marital relationship. Her husband was a good provider. His recreational activities were socially acceptable. He did not interfere in her handling of the children (and neglect of them) and had no objections to her spending much time during the day talking and visiting with her girl friends. The Sundays that Mr. Tallow did not go hunting or fishing with his men friends he spent with the family visiting with relatives. To the outsider it seemed a good marriage. The fact that this couple shared nothing and did not even have a common interest in the children was not readily observable.

### **Background of Family**

Looking back over the history of the marriage as given by the Tallows, we find that after eight years of marriage (and the birth of two girls) Mr. Tallow *volunteered* for the service during the war. Mrs. Tallow was pregnant at the time and gave birth to David while her husband was overseas. For his first two years David slept with his mother. Then his father returned from the service. Needless to say, David was angry with this stranger who replaced him in his mother's bed. Mr. Tallow made several minor efforts to be friendly with his son, which met with rejection. Mr. Tallow then gave up, figuring that the boy just didn't like him, and made no further effort to have anything to do with him. David remained close to his mother and made every effort to please her so as not to be pushed away (as he was in bed). He identified with her and his sisters. David did many of the household chores, including cooking, and received much approval from his mother for his helpfulness.

David tested dull normal on the Stanford Binet. Yet he was unable to function at all in school. Although he was very fond of his teacher (he was in a special class) he seemed unable to advance beyond first grade aca-

demic work. He had strong feelings of inadequacy and inferiority. Despite his large size he was fearful of participating in sports. He had a slight speech impediment.

Kenny on the other hand was an alert, bright, very adequate boy. Only eight, he still was the "brains" behind much of the delinquent behavior. His school work was good and he was in a normal class far ahead of his brother. David felt that Kenny got him into trouble. Even more than this, Kenny's functioning was a constant reminder to him of his own inferiority. Mr. Tallow had little to do with Kenny either, but obviously approved more of him than of David. Playmates liked Kenny and rejected David. Because of these factors David's hate for Kenny was so intense that at times the institution staff feared for the younger boy's life. Not only would David violently attack his brother but he was so out of control at times that he could not hear or respond to intervening adults. The psychiatrist confirmed that David's impulse was actually to murder Kenny.

Our recommendation (acted on by the court) was to place David in a treatment institution where he could have a total therapeutic experience. In addition to intensive psychotherapy he would have the benefits of a controlled environment and special educational help. Kenny was to continue in placement on a trial basis for a year and to have regular casework contacts. The parents were to continue regular casework interviews. The ultimate goal was the possibility that the family would be reunited after some years if they could respond to treatment. It was definitely felt that there was no constructive plan in which these two boys could live together.

In spite of the authoritative element resulting from the court role, these parents were not negative to the treatment plan suggested. Their desire was to have the boys back home and they were anxious to involve themselves in help which would make this possible. They were not sufficiently aware of the unhealthy relationship between the boys and their own part in this, so this constituted

an area where we would have to concentrate. However, they did feel separation of the boys was necessary on the grounds that David needed a special kind of help which Kenny did not need.

### Conclusion

There are times when separation of siblings in placement is the best plan. These case histories illustrate three situations in which separation seemed indicated. The guiding principles which pointed in the direction of separation were discussed in each case. Our agency has been exploring this phase of placement in a planned manner for only a few years, and consequently this paper cannot approach a definitive summary of principles. Our hope is that other placement agencies will be stimulated to examine their experiences in this area and will be able to:

- (1) confirm and elaborate our preliminary findings, and
- (2) evolve additional formulae which may be used as a guide to deciding when separation is indicated.

### UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

The basic Two-Year Graduate Curriculum in social casework or social group work prepares for professional social work practice in all fields. It leads to the degree of Master of Social Work.

The Advanced Curriculum offers to qualified persons who hold a Master's degree in social work an advanced, third year of graduate professional education in social casework, group work, welfare organization, supervision, administration, teaching, or research. This curriculum leads to the Advanced Certificate.

The Doctoral Curriculum for candidates for the degree of Doctor of Social Work includes, and continues beyond, the Advanced Curriculum in any one of its specializations.

Fellowships are available to students in all curricula.

Address all inquiries to:

(MISS) MARGARET E. BISHOP  
Director of Admissions and Placement  
School of Social Work  
University of Pennsylvania  
2410 Pine Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

# THE REPLACEMENT OF CHILDREN FROM FOSTER HOMES

**Norman Herstein**

Assistant Director  
Foster Care Division  
Illinois Children's Home and  
Aid Society, Chicago

*This is a preliminary report of an agency's study of replacement. It offers for consideration the thesis that since replacement cannot always be avoided, attention should be focused on how to make it a constructive experience.*

ONE OF THE skeletons in the closet of child welfare practice is the process known as "replacement." Perhaps a major reason for this is that the removal of children from agency-provided resources, such as foster homes, is frequently, and, in some instances, justifiably, associated with some failure on the part of the agency to utilize to its maximum effectiveness the skills and knowledge already within its possession. Therefore, guilt and defensive denial may operate to thrust the question of replacement into the limbo of painful and dimly considered facts. Nevertheless, only through a candid review of the conditions of replacement can an agency hope to develop the knowledge required to prevent unnecessary replacements.

We therefore start with the recognition that a significant number of children under agency care are still being replaced. We know that some of these replacements have occurred because of factors not significantly related to the foster parents' relationship with the child, the child's problems, the skills of the caseworker, the activity of the parent, nor to additional factors within the agency's ability to foresee, know, control, or help. Some examples of these are: the death or serious illness of the foster parent, change of residence, the birth of children, moving in of relatives, and financial problems reflected in the foster mother's need to go to work.

However, in this connection a word of caution is needed. After examining these situations we discovered that in many instances, they also reflected the foster parents' dissatisfactions with the children under their care and represented ways of resolving the difficulties inherent in their relationships. Cases of this nature would be found in the

category of replacements which roughly constitutes those children who are replaced primarily as a result of the negative, psychological factors within the foster family, the disturbances within the child, the negative influences of the child's own relatives, and many other factors which fall within the caseworker's responsibility either to forestall or manage effectively. It is this group to which we shall address ourselves primarily.<sup>1</sup>

Another group of replacements consists of those children who by plan have originally been placed on a temporary basis. These temporary placements may be in the nature of care until a more permanent placement plan is formulated, or those who are placed in the home for diagnostic study purposes to discover a sound basis for an appropriate treatment plan.

## ***When Replacement Has Value***

In recognizing the caseworker's responsibility to anticipate adequately and to prevent failures in foster home placement, we see that not enough tested knowledge is available to fulfill all the requirements of this responsibility. We can, however, establish this as a goal and attempt to approximate it more closely as needed knowledge is widened and its implications assimilated. In the meantime, as long as we lack sufficient tools to match successfully foster homes to children in every case, and as long as available foster home resources do not always measure up to our expectations or predictions, we shall need to regard replacement as an inevitable and necessary part of child welfare

<sup>1</sup> The question of the removal of children from institutions does not fall within the scope of this paper.



practice. This challenges us to formulate some principles which may guide us in reaching a sound decision regarding replacement, and to implement this decision so as to reduce its negative effects and assure, as far as possible, a beneficial transition of the child from the foster home.

When, contrary to the agency's best efforts and expectations, a foster home is found to be failing to provide the child with the experiences necessary for his continued growth, the agency is faced with a difficult dilemma. It must either decide to preserve the placement despite its gravely serious shortcomings, or to renounce temporarily its objective of providing the child with continuity of care, and to replace him into another setting.

Sometimes, the decision for replacement is taken out of the agency's hands by the foster family's urgent request for removal, and another plan must be substituted hurriedly. When this occurs, the agency may be in the least favorable position to plan constructively for the child, and the possibilities for repeated failure in the next placement are accordingly increased. Consequently, it is the caseworker's continuous diagnostic task to read the "handwriting on the wall" with sufficient clarity so as to anticipate and forestall the termination of placements in this manner. This means that the caseworker maintains regular interviews with the foster parents, is alert to what the foster parents are trying to say in each interview, is ready to discuss freely with the foster parents any problems they have either indicated by indirection or stated directly, and is vigilant in making significant observations of the child's behavior and the interrelationships within the foster home during her visits. Under these circumstances, it would be highly unlikely that a request for removal by foster parents would fall upon the caseworker unaware, since the latter would have anticipated this eventuality in the course of her regular visits and to some degree helped the foster parents to arrive at this decision. Ideally regarded, then, *the replacement decision should be the emotionally logical culmination*

*ing point of the shared relationship between the caseworker and foster parent*—a relationship which began well before the discussion of actual replacement was entered into, and which dealt with the incipient difficulties terminating in the decision to place the child in another home. There are two contrasting situations which may be discussed briefly to illustrate this point.

The first situation involves the foster parent who might freely share problems with the caseworker, if given permission to do so. Sometimes, in the caseworker's zealous attempt to "accentuate the positive" and give encouragement to the foster parent to go on with the child, she may not pay sufficient attention to the complaints and even subtly discourage them by going counter to the prevailing feeling tones conveyed by the foster parent. The ability of the caseworker to meet feelings courageously and freely serves the following purposes:

1. It allows the foster parent to receive help in clearing up the difficulty.
2. It gives the caseworker a series of diagnostic warning signals which she can use to plan on a long-term basis.
3. It allows an early focusing on problems, so that there may be sufficient time to work through the reasons for replacement and, if they are not resolved, to gain the foster parents' cooperation in the plan to the best of their ability.

The second situation involves foster parents who, in reaction to a sense of failure, may defensively cover up difficulties with the child. This may arise from the caseworker's too exclusive concern for the child, and consequent slighting of the foster parents' feelings of guilt and failure in relation to the child. Here, the caseworker's ability to accept—"feel with"—and understand the foster parents' problems with the child, and support their realistic strengths, may allay excessive defensiveness of the foster parents which mitigates sharing with the worker.

### ***Effect of Replacement on Child***

Before an agency decides to move toward replacement, it must *evaluate carefully the negative psychological implications which the replacement process itself may have upon the*



child. For it should be recognized that replacement frequently has the effect of revivifying previous rejection and separation experiences in the life of the child and of confirming further the pathological processes set in motion by these experiences. This point is eloquently supported by an impressive array of findings which have accumulated over the years to the effect that replaced children frequently and progressively deteriorate in their ability to cope successfully with reality. The impact of repeated separation experiences upon ego functioning has been reflected, in part, in the following symptoms, attitudes and feelings:

1. There is a lasting distrust of parents and adult caretakers expressed in negative defenses against dependence upon parental figures at a time when this is realistically necessary for the child's positive growth, development and even survival. This is accompanied by a lack of responsiveness to others, denial of the need for love relationships, and a shallowness of affect.
2. Learning and motor inhibitions extend from situations where the child is operating on a generally retarded level to those in which the child has severe malfunctioning in specific areas of perceptual and motor learning.
3. There is a defective ability to identify positively with community and family values accompanied by an inability to control and channelize constructively the hostile, sexual, dependent and other impulses which have been excessively heightened by psychic and physical deprivation.
4. The child's self-image is altered profoundly and he sees himself as a damaged, defective, inferior being or, defensively as an omnipotent, powerful, magical person.

These facts cause us to pause in formulating a decision for replacement, but, of course, do not necessarily preclude it. Therefore, when replacement is necessary, we are left to fall back upon our casework skills in attempting to cushion the shock as much as possible. For example, the degree to which the worker can enter into a meaningful relationship with the child, so that the latter may freely express his feelings about the replacement and receive help geared to correct any distortions in these feelings; and manage pre-placement visits so that these are closely in accord with his psychological readiness to master the

placement experience will be important factors in determining the success of the replacement plan.

The extent to which the foster parents can be mobilized to participate constructively in the replacement process will also have an exceedingly important bearing upon the outcome of replacement. Situations in which the foster parents oppose the agency's view that replacement is necessary tend to add fuel to the child's own separation conflicts and add immeasurably to the difficulties of helping him over the hurdles of removal. This is particularly true in situations where the child has become an essential part of the foster parents' defensive structure, and where replacement represents a direct attack upon these defenses. It is also true in those situations where the reciprocal ties of the child to the foster parent have also become an integral part of his own adaptive mechanisms.

### **Foster Parents' Part**

How does it come about that the child's personality reflects in part that of the foster parent? It is evident, for example, that a child's earlier experiences with his own parents or previous parent-surrogates set the pattern for his subsequent relationship with others. However, he cannot:

"remain for a period emotionally suspended without human objects to love and depend upon. . . . Emotions find object relationships even though injured by loss of previous objects."<sup>2</sup>

The child's attempts to master and resolve the experiences of rejection and separation from his own parents goes hand in hand with a corresponding process in which he sends out tendrils of relationship toward the members of the substitute family.

The tempo and extent of his reaching out will, of course, depend in part upon the length of his stay in the home, the age at which he was placed in the home—the early formative years being most crucial to the development

<sup>2</sup> Margaret Wilson Gerard and Rita Dukette, "Techniques for Preventing Separation Trauma in Child Placement," *The Emotionally Disturbed Child*, Papers on Diagnosis, Treatment and Care, New York: Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 1956, p. 48.

of lasting ties within the home, and the child's stage of development. In the dependent stage, his fears of separation and reliance on the foster family members would be at their height; if an adolescent, his thrusts toward independence and his seeking of other contacts outside the home may not only dilute his intense anxiety concerning separation, but also lessen the foster parents' ability to meet their symbiotic needs through him. This means that the decision for replacement should be reached as much as possible before the child's position in the foster family structure has become irreversibly crystallized and hardened, or, as in the case of some adolescents, when the pathological equilibrium formerly established between the child and his foster parents is altered, diluted, or burst asunder by various internal or external pressures.

Even under these auspicious conditions, it is highly important that the caseworker not only focus upon the child's needs as an independent unit, but also upon the needs of the foster parents, since these will determine the emotional atmosphere under which the child's removal from the home takes place. In helping the foster parents accept the need for replacement, the caseworker would need to ascertain what the child's removal means to the foster parents. Her diagnostic evaluation of this issue would form the crux of her specific mode of handling this with them. For example, if the central meaning of replacement to the foster parents is that they are being condemned and punished for their behavior to the child, and that their integrity as people is being attacked, it is especially important that the caseworker be careful to maintain a balanced, objective, non-critical role with them. It might further be possible for the caseworker to arrange a series of closely spaced interviews with the foster parents over a short period of time to help them work out some of their feelings regarding the child's replacement. In determining the optimum period for such discussions, the caseworker would keep in mind that either a precipitous removal of the child in the interests of "rescuing him" from a destructive

situation, or too long a period of delay in which the anxieties of both foster parents and child will be excessively heightened might contribute to negative consequences in the replacement process.

The foster parents' own sense of timing and comfort would play a part in determining the speed of replacement. Therefore, how the replacement is to be interpreted to them will be an important factor. In keeping with the casework objective of preserving the intactness of the foster parents' egos, the caseworker would:

1. present the reasons for replacement in terms which would be both realistic and within the boundaries of what the foster parents can emotionally and objectively accept,
2. meet the feelings of the foster parents as they arise,
3. give realistic and valid reassurance whenever the foster parents are expressing neurotic feelings of inadequacy and guilt regarding the child.

In a situation where the welfare of the child appears to conflict with the comfort or welfare of other persons intimately concerned with the child, a stress situation is built up, testing the limits of the caseworker's ability to maintain a balance in identifying with the needs of both. Her ability to preserve this balance of identifications may well be influential in mobilizing the foster parents to accept the necessity for replacement.

### ***Evaluating Available Resources***

An additional consideration in arriving at a sound decision regarding replacement is the question of whether there are appropriate resources available for the child. In the heat of urgency to replace a child from a pathological setting, it sometimes happens that the subsequent resource has not been properly evaluated and weighed in terms of his future needs and requirements. Because replacement itself may result in additional psychological damage to the child, it is doubly imperative that the plan include a careful diagnosis of the resource, in order to be as sure as possible that subsequent replacement will not be in the offing. Indeed, it sometimes happens that replacement plans have been made, the new foster parents

of delay in  
er parents  
heightened  
nsequences  
  
of timing  
etermining  
re, how the  
o them will  
g with the  
the intact.  
the case.  
  
n terms which  
he boundaries  
otionally and  
  
rents as they  
  
whenever the  
tic feelings of  
child.  
  
of the child  
fort or wel-  
concerned  
is built up,  
ker's ability  
ng with the  
reserve this  
ell be influ-  
parents to  
ent.  
  
es  
  
arriving at  
lacement is  
appropriate  
In the heat  
m a patho-  
ppens that  
een proper-  
rms of his  
Because re-  
additional  
child, it is  
n include a  
in order to  
sequent re-  
ng. Indeed,  
replacement  
ster parents

alerted to the coming of the child, and the first pre-placement visit consummated, when, contrary to the agency's expectations, the new foster family reverses its decision to accept him. While situations such as these may be unavoidable due to the limitations in our ability to predict behavior, we must scrutinize the placement plan most carefully in the light of the child's needs.

The evaluation of resources should be made against the background of a long-term plan, solidly based on as comprehensive a diagnosis of the child's needs as possible, and with a consideration of the treatment measures necessary to fulfill these needs. Naturally, resources are not perfect; frequently, the long-term goals must be tailored not only to the child's needs but also the availability and potentialities of existing resources.

One of the questions which the caseworker should ask herself is: Are the advantages in the new plan sufficient to warrant removal from the current setting? This is a question which becomes particularly important when existing resources have identified limits in their capacity to fulfill long-term goals for the child. If, for example, it is decided that a child requires intensive therapy within an integrated institutional program, it is fortunate that such a resource can be located, the child admitted on the basis of the treatment institution's intake policy, and the agency can pay the high cost of such care. If another type of resource, such as a foster home, must be used, one may scale the goals down to more realistic limits, but keep in mind the essentials for meeting the child's needs. For example, it might be possible to use supplementary resources in the community such as special school facilities, tutoring, and direct casework help; the foster home may offer sufficient advantages in meeting some of the child's crucial needs, such as setting up benign controls to behavior, teaching him needed skills, etc.

### Conclusions

The basic implication of these observations is clearly that replacement is not simply a matter of removing a child intact as one

would remove a raisin from a cookie. It entails major surgery of a vital portion of his psychic anatomy. Similarly, it sometimes means profound alterations of the total family pattern of interrelationships within the foster home—depending on the degree to which the child has been a dynamic force in determining this pattern. To the degree that the child's position in the foster home has assumed the equivalent proportions of his relationship to his own parents, the foster parents must be regarded in the same light psychologically as the child's own parents. Then, too, the agency must be sure that alternative resources available for the child will appropriately meet his needs. The fact that the child-placing agency is in a stronger position authority-wise to effect replacement than it frequently is to initiate placement should not blind it to the psychological and practical realities involved in a child's removal—realities which in the last analysis are the true authorities for decision-making.

## University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work Pittsburgh 13, Pa.



### PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION for men and women

*Leading to the Master of Social Work and  
to the Doctor of Social Work Degrees*

**The Master's Degree may be earned  
with either the *Work-Study Program*  
(Plan A) or the *2 year full-time Pro-  
gram* (Plan B)**

**The Doctorate program emphasizes  
teaching, research and administration**



# NO LONGER "LEFT OUT"

**Albert J. Neely**

Director, Division of Child Welfare  
Cook County Department of Welfare  
Chicago, Illinois

*This program of homefinding, though still in the developmental stage, may have valuable suggestions for other communities struggling with the same problems.*

FEW SOCIAL welfare problems in recent years have aroused such total community concern, organization, and productive action by the people of Cook County, Illinois<sup>1</sup> as did in 1954 the shocking, shameful, tragic plight of well babies "growing up" in the Cook County Hospital for months as boarder babies. Daily these well babies were being subjected to the well-known limitations of congregate care. They were being "boarded" in the hospital because the county's overburdened agencies were unable to provide them with foster home or adoption placement services. This service drained off vital, expensive hospital facilities and services sorely needed for sick children.

On a typical day in 1954 Cook County Hospital reported thirty to forty boarder babies in ward cribs with red tags showing each newborn baby who was waiting for its birthright, a home with family—waiting for a responsible community to see that this deserved birthright was forthcoming. This problem, which aroused Cook County's conscience—its sense of social and civic responsibility—to a fighting pitch with insistent demands for remedial action, is the same kind of child welfare problem which today plagues other communities.

The 1954 "boarder baby" situation in Chicago was also typical of the serious plight of toddlers and older dependent children about whom the community was concerned because they were being cared for in temporary, unsatisfactory living arrangements, or sheltered in the local detention home designed for delinquents. Many dependent children were sheltered in the detention home awaiting placement for disturbingly longer periods than delinquents. For

all these children the sad story was the same—the demoralizing wait, in fear, confusion, anxiety, feeling unwanted while an agency was being sought to accept responsibility for needed permanent placement.

## *A Remedy for the Problem*

Because of the lack of facilities, these children became vividly described and identified in the heart of our community as the "left out children." "Left out" not because of what they were, for they were children needing care, but because sectarian services, the city welfare program of child care, or other voluntary agencies were already overburdened carrying a costly number of such children. This growing problem had been recognized since 1924, and various and partially successful efforts to remedy it had been made. However, it was brought to a head in 1954 primarily because of the grave boarder baby situation. The remedy sought was the establishment of the public child-placing service with county-wide jurisdiction which state legislation had made legally possible in 1949.

In 1954 the thorny task of getting appropriated the county funds necessary to set up and operate such a program still remained undone. As a result of a powerful representative citizens' committee, sponsored by the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago; the recommendations of County Hospital officials; vigorous endorsement of the press; and the recommendations of a special study made by Raymond M. Hilliard, Director, Cook County Department of Welfare and requested by the County Commissioners—funds were appropriated. By 1955 a new public child-placing service, within the Cook County Department of Welfare, was able to meet the problem of finding homes for boarder

<sup>1</sup> This embraces much of the metropolitan Chicago area.



babies and additional children other agencies were unable to accept for placement.<sup>2</sup>

On June 6, 1955 the Cook County Department of Welfare opened the doors of its new Division of Child Welfare for foster home and adoption placement services. It is significant to note that the new program gave the Chicago area its first public child placement service which accepted children specifically for adoption placement.

The Division of Child Welfare got under way in a community where reported shortages of boarding and adoptive homes for these infants (over 90 per cent of whom are Negro) were both chronic and acute. However, the Division held fast to one vital conviction basic to the success of any home-finding effort—that homes could be found if the need for them were made known to the community. As a new agency, the Division fortunately found itself free of the paralyzing fetters of inertia, frustration and cynicism which, in time, tend to incrust overworked, overburdened, homefinding programs of long standing.

With one borrowed baby home of questionable value on hand, the Division moved immediately to blanket with homefinding appeals people who might be potential foster parents. Full capital was to be made of the community's interest in the plight of the "left out boarder baby." The heightened indignation of citizens, determined that "boarder babies" must be given a "new lease on life" with family and home and thus removed from County Hospital well-baby nursery rows, was a hot iron the Division struck right away. Initial and subsequent appeals for foster homes brought favorable results. Our homefinding appeals were structured with immediate and long-range targets in mind. Priority was given to acquiring immediately sufficient prospective foster homes, informing the community that this new service was in business and ready to

<sup>2</sup> In 1949, as Commissioner of the City of New York Department of Welfare, Raymond M. Hilliard directed the establishment of a similar public child-placing service in that department which was designed to help remedy this situation.

accept any help families could give as foster parents. We made the subject of the "boarder baby needing a home" a "household topic" among those, directly and indirectly, able to bring in prospective foster parents themselves, their relatives, friends, co-workers, or fellow church members, among others. All foster families sought had to meet prevailing minimum standards set by the State Department of Public Welfare.

The Division of Child Welfare has emphasized from the beginning, that it would have no "magic" to work upon this problem it was to help alleviate. The homefinding philosophy, techniques and practices were the same ones long established among child-placing agencies as being most effective in interesting potential foster and adoptive parents. Our emphasis, of necessity, had to be on attacking the job of finding homes using the quickest, most effective means capable of bringing results in the shortest possible time, and we tailored these tools to meet our specific needs.

### *Some Important Advance Spadework*

Groundwork for the first direct appeal for homes by the Division of Child Welfare actually began several weeks before the Division opened its doors. In May, 1955 the Cook County Board of Commissioners, acting upon the suggestion of Mr. Hilliard, sponsored an official "Foster Mother's Day in Cook County"—another first in county history. On this Foster Mother's Day the County Board paid tribute, on behalf of the community, to the devotion and service to children of all foster mothers in the county, from public and voluntary child-placing agencies, at a downtown hotel in an impressive ceremony attended by 200 invited guests, the Board of Commissioners and the wife of the Mayor of Chicago. Full press, radio and television coverage before and after the ceremony resulted in highlighting the theme of foster motherhood throughout Metropolitan Chicago. In this manner it gave both long overdue public recognition and positive interpretation of the service of foster mothers. This Foster Mother's Day has now been established as an annual event,

in which all agencies participate in the recognition of its importance as one means of effectively creating and maintaining favorable attitudes about foster care in the public eye.

There can be no denial that the first Foster Mother's Day played an important part in creating a climate of interest and receptivity favorable to the direct appeal for homes which the Division of Child Welfare activated in the following weeks and months. Foster Mother's Day or Foster Family Days are but two of many themes related to foster care which agencies unfortunately still neglect to exploit to cultivate and maintain receptive, interested, productive publics whose help they need not only for homefinding but for other aspects of program.<sup>3</sup>

As a first step special personal contacts were made with the Negro newspapers and radio personalities (announcers, newscasters, disc jockeys, radio ministers) whose audiences were definitely known to be almost exclusively composed of listeners in the communities from which prospects must come. Specially prepared feature stories, news releases and spot announcements, emphasizing the plight of the left out child and boarder babies and appealing for homes, were put in the hands of press and radio representatives in a position to get them printed or on the air. Program directors and community relations representatives of all radio and television outlets were personally contacted by the departmental administrator asking for cooperation in blanketing the community with the immediate need for boarder baby homes by our new agency.

At the same time, the Director of the Division of Child Welfare was cultivating and following through with direct and indirect personal contacts and appeals with church leaders, congregations and auxiliaries, civic, social, business, professional and fraternal clubs, schools and P.T.A. leaders, labor unions, community houses, and like

groups. The preparation and dissemination of thousands of simple appeal brochures entitled "We Need Homes And Love For The Left Out Children"; individual special delivery letters to key people timed for strategic arrival; and direct mail of other literature to all groups were added phases of the overall job of reaching the people which our predicament demanded.

### ***Appeals and Results***

The success of homefinding is in direct proportion to the time, staff, skill, ingenuity, conviction put into it. We believe our homefinding investment has been encouragingly productive. Our appeals first began to hit the public on June 15, 1955, nine days after our office opened. In the next two weeks ending on June 30, 400 inquiries had been received and serviced by the two supervisors and five caseworkers assigned for duty. In the following months of July and August, 469 and 286 more unduplicated inquiries were received, making a two and one-half month total of a little more than 1,100 inquiries. The trying, time-consuming road from inquiry, to formal application, to accepted home needs no elaboration here. Careful attention and planning were given to devising various means whereby the time between appeal, inquiry and final acceptance of a home could be cut down. Special telephone screening procedures for caseworkers, design and use of standard forms and letters, flexible priorities for application processing and study, special clerical routines and policies, and home study techniques to cut out non-pertinent data, red tape, and frills for the purpose of keeping study content, emphasis and focus on the pertinent dynamics to be diagnosed and evaluated in the application—all were part of the action picture as inquiries and applications came into the office.

Applications were hustled right out to screened prospects and once returned, were acknowledged within forty-eight hours. No application sat around waiting to be assigned; all were assigned to a caseworker within twenty-four hours after receipt. Caseworker, supervisory and administrative con-

<sup>3</sup> Social work needs to learn the techniques and results of public relations and educational devices which the business world calls "institutional advertising," that is, keeping consistently in the public's mind the value and importance of goods and services.

controls made it possible for a casework supervisor or the division director to know at any time, the status, movement and current or anticipated disposition of any particular inquiry, application or home study.

Our homefinding focus was oriented to the reality that the foster homes found would range in calibre from excellent to those which would maintain and rise above minimum standards only with close agency supervision. We sought the best available homes and not the illusive ideal situation. As we anticipated, our inquiries, applications, and approved homes came from the life blood of any community—the hard-working unsophisticated parents, grandparents, relatives and others who care about children. All of them had the precious gifts of love, understanding, acceptance to offer a child. These are our community's "little people," but big in the values of life which count in child care. Such valuable resources which we have found in some deceptively unostentatious surroundings are easily predisposed to being overlooked by some homefinders out of touch with the reality of their task.

In response to the first 1,100 inquiries, applications were mailed to 700 prospects believed worthy of further consideration. Three hundred and fifty returns were received immediately and assigned for study; 100 were received and assigned two weeks after the initial appeal. In checking the returns it was found that the 25 per cent return of applications from initial inquiries was better than the 10 per cent return which the national advertising council called "good" in its experiences with public appeals via the communication media we used. One undesired result—over 150 letters and long-distance calls from people in twenty-two states wanting to care for our boarder babies—was in response to a feature appeal article which unexpectedly showed up in the national edition of a large Negro newspaper. It takes time to refer such inquirers to an appropriate agency in their home area.

Our initial homefinding recruitment efforts have been followed by appeals, timed strategically to maintain a momentum of incoming

applications for current and anticipated needs. In twenty months we have licensed 120 homes. Over 2,300 initial inquiries were received; 1,300 applications sent out and 800 applications returned.

### ***Homefinding Efforts Begin To Pay Off***

Our agency believes its investment in homefinding efforts have been encouragingly productive of resources so easily considered to be non-existent. A new child-placing agency still serving a relatively modest number of children, we were heartened by our success in placing in a matter of weeks, all infants referred for placement. Just about all of these infants had been waiting months for placement before referral to us. Yet almost all are placed in homes where, as the only child, they can command the much-needed full measure of a mother's love and care. Similar progress has been made to date in finding boarding homes for toddlers with physical, social and mental handicaps, or with a large number of siblings—plainly harder to place. To date thirty-five infants under one year of age and thirty-five toddlers and youngsters generally under four years of age have been placed in boarding homes. Adoptive homes have been found for fifteen infants and toddlers. Another fifty children varying in age from six to sixteen years, and including family groups of four, five, six and seven; a child handicapped by blindness and retardation; several epileptics; and others with behavior symptomatic of trauma have also been placed during the first twenty months.

Actually, homefinding for babies had to be moderated slightly, to keep acquisition of baby homes geared down to the rate of babies referred for placement. At certain times factors affecting baby referrals caused downward estimates of babies needing referral. This highlights the morass of a legal and procedural obstacle that boarder babies must weather to be declared eligible for our service. The weeks, formerly months, involved cause a serious bottleneck in service to infants which, though improved by our special efforts, is still a disturbing problem



and a handicap to the ongoing development of our program.

Nevertheless, County Hospital reports that the 1,280 days of boarder baby care provided in June, 1955 had been dramatically cut to 406 days in June, 1956, one year after the Division of Child Welfare began to operate. Average wait for placement in the hospital had been cut from an average of three and one-half months to less than one and one-third months. This improvement can be traced, directly and indirectly, to the placement program and its effect in stimulating increased and improved services and placement to boarder babies by the family (juvenile) court and the various child-placing agencies in the community. In cold dollars and cents it should be noted that County Hospital boarder baby care costs \$18.41 per diem. Quick computation reveals \$16,000 less had to be spent for hospital well-baby care in June 1956 than in June 1955. The per diem cost of foster home care is approximately less than one-third of the \$18.41 per diem of well-baby hospital care. The cumulative total of the drop in well-baby hospital care costs over the past twenty-month period is even more impressive.

#### ***Advisory Committee Leadership***

Yes, the boarder baby is much less a problem today in Cook County, Illinois. However, only constant diligence and continued improvement over what has been started can forestall what has happened elsewhere—the tragedy of the problem breaking out again in its initial serious proportions.

Credit for these continuing developments rests with the members of the blue ribbon Advisory Committee to our Division of Child Welfare. The committee includes:

the top administrators of all major voluntary agencies, the director of the City of Chicago Welfare Department's children's service, top family court administrative staff, the superintendent of the local detention home, the president, executive director and head of the Family and Child Welfare Division of the Welfare Council, officials of County Hospital, a state legislator, a child welfare social worker, and outstanding lay representatives of the racial and religious groups and geographical areas.

Here is found the core of vigorous community determination which continues to make available its influence, leadership, support, and experience to the actual job of cleaning up the "boarder baby mess." All were active participants in the organized community action leading to the establishment of our new program.

#### ***Conclusion***

The homefinding efforts of the new Division of Child Welfare during the past twenty months illustrate how existing knowledge, techniques and practical experience in homefinding can be put into practice with good results. Our experience, as well as that of others, suggests that this homefinding method could be used fruitfully in a variety of community settings.

We know this to be true from a first-hand experience with one of the largest public child-placing agencies in the country. This agency's decision a few years ago to revitalize and reorganize its sluggish homefinding operations, using this basic methodology, led in a relatively short time to the liquidation of its "traditional" backlog of boarder babies awaiting placement. Production of new foster homes hit an all time agency high—homefinders and some new foster parents even complained that some of the new baby homes were not being put into use fast enough.

Homefinding has good reason to be called one of the most fascinating and difficult challenges in child welfare. It is a unique combination among other things of casework dynamics, community organization, and social work administration. There are few more telling indexes measuring community awareness, acceptance, and understanding of an agency's purpose and service. Homefinding recruitment too long has been the headache and victim of sporadic appeals, off and on again emphasis, ineffective, unimaginative direction, and the dead hand of inertia and ineptitude. The absence of bold, imaginative, energetic, planful and concrete expressions of positive convictions that homes can be found for boarder babies exacts



a heavy toll at the expense of the defenseless little ones.

The batting average of social agencies' skills in communicating, interpreting or just plain "telling it effectively to the people" is in sad need of improvement. We live in the day of unprecedented competition for the eyes, ears, time, attention, support, and interest of the individual by all sorts of appeals and causes. For too long we have been drowned out or tuned out because someone smarter than we has found the keys to reaching effectively the various publics we must reach if the foster homes so urgently needed are to be recruited.

### 1957 Mary E. Boretz Awards

The Child Welfare League of America was pleased to present three 1957 Mary E. Boretz Awards at its Annual Dinner Meeting at the National Conference on Social Welfare in Philadelphia.

The First Award is shared by three people for their notable contribution to the subject of "A Form of Internship for Beginning Workers (Child Welfare Training Units in Mississippi)." They are Miss Kate Berry Shepherd, Supervisor of Field Staff and Training, State Child Welfare Division, Department of Public Welfare, Jackson, Mississippi; Mrs. Adele Grant Husband, Supervisor of Harrison County Child Welfare Training Unit, Department of Public Welfare, Gulfport, Mississippi; and Mr. Herschel Saucier, Supervisor of Hinds County Training Unit, Jackson, Mississippi.

Mr. Milton Willner, who won the first Mary E. Boretz Award in 1954 for his fine paper on "An Institutional Approach to the Parent-Child Relationship," received the second prize for his paper on "Treatment of Gangs in a Delinquent Boys' Institution" which appeared in the June issue of *CHILD WELFARE*. Mr. Willner, is Director of Clinical Services, Berkshire Industrial Farm, Canaan, New York.

The third citation, an Honorable Mention, was presented to Miss Cornelia Ougheltree, Special Consultant, Federation of Protestant

Welfare Agencies, New York, New York, for her paper on "Finding Foster Homes." The first and third Award papers will be published in pamphlet form.

This year papers were submitted from diverse sections of the country by persons active in the field of child welfare. The winning manuscripts were selected by a Committee of sixteen practitioners of long experience in the various child welfare services. The criteria, established by the Award Committee at the time of the Award's inception in 1951, stipulate that eligible manuscripts must deal with subject matter in the field of child welfare, and be based on the writer's current or recent direct experience or research in the field; they should be timely and original in approach, and be written clearly and effectively.

### Janice Bowen Returns to Portland, Maine

We announce with deep regret the loss to the League staff of our Field Consultant Janice Bowen. She is reassuming the directorship of the now expanded program of our member agency, the Child and Family Services of Portland.

## NEWS FROM THE FIELD

### *Parent Discussion Meetings— A Protective Service Agency's Experience*

IN NOVEMBER 1956, the Protective Service Division of the Jefferson County Welfare Department, Louisville, Kentucky, began a series of parent discussion meetings for clients who had come to their attention for neglect or abuse of children. Preliminary discussions with other groups in the community which had attempted such meetings revealed the failure of those efforts. These parents not only lacked the motivation to attend such meetings, but had realistic financial problems which would make it impossible for them to get baby sitters and pay for transportation.

The fact that these parents needed this help was never debated. The problem was

how to get them there. It was decided that arrangements to pay for baby sitters and transportation would eliminate the practical reasons which had been given in the past for failure to attend other such meetings. Meetings would be held at the Neighborhood House and refreshments would be served. We were fortunate in finding a church group interested in sponsoring a project in parent education, which agreed to pay baby-sitter, transportation, and refreshment expenses. One of our staff caseworkers, Mrs. Theresa Noller, had had experience in conducting group discussions. She volunteered to serve as the leader for the meetings.

Next, caseworkers had to interpret the meetings to their clients. Most of the clients approached were past any agency resistance they might have had initially, but still had many problems in caring for their children. Attendance at the meetings was interpreted as an opportunity to share experiences and ideas with others who had similar problems. Emphasis was placed upon what they had to contribute to others. The group was also interpreted as a way of demonstrating their cooperation with this agency. We were prepared to carry this even further, if necessary to see that they attended at least once, because we felt confident that they would enjoy the meetings and would return.

At the first three meetings, the attendance was disappointing. Only three persons attended one meeting. We could be encouraged by only one thing: those who attended obviously enjoyed themselves and expressed enthusiasm about continuing. By plan, the caseworkers revisited the people who had not attended and those who did not return. We made a study of the reasons given and a survey as to the best time of day for the majority of the interested group. We found the best time to be at night, though we lost a few people who worked at night. The meetings were held every two weeks for a six-month period. Individual letters were sent before each meeting, giving recognition to those who had attended and complimenting them on their contributions. Others were encouraged to return or to attend for the

first time. By the fourth meeting we had an enthusiastic core group. Through continued efforts by the caseworkers and the encouragement of the letters, the group grew to thirteen.

The leader planned the programs primarily by suggesting topics, and on a number of occasions introducing films, as a basis for discussion. Most of the discussion was by the group. The participation was always lively. At times, the leader had to control those who tended to dominate, but usually the group took care of that. Disagreements were accepted in a friendly way by all. It was always difficult to terminate meetings. This was handled by planning topics for the next meeting.

One example of the interaction of the group is a discussion of activities parents had with their children and the values of parents and children working together. Mr. Matthews dominated the discussion, expressing his feelings about housework and how he hated it. As a child, his stepmother had made him do housework and had forced him to adhere to her rigid standards. As he discussed the manner in which he supervised his children's activities, he showed his own rigid feelings on the subject and his tendency to require perfection. Mrs. Kase attempted to help Mr. Matthews understand himself. She felt the treatment he had received from his stepmother had "rubbed off" on him. As a result, he was fanatical about these things. Mrs. Kase asked Mr. Matthews why he had to have things so perfect, why he was doing the same things to his children that he complained about his stepmother doing to him. She referred to what he had said about the feeling of belonging and acceptance he has received from his wife, and wondered why he was not now able to be more accepting of his children's behavior, instead of behaving as his stepmother had, which had been painful for him. Mr. Matthews was not able to answer, but it was obvious that having his own behavior presented to him by a fellow participant had started him thinking.

All the parents seemed sincerely sorry to discontinue meetings for the summer and anticipated starting again in the Fall. The group itself planned to make the last meeting a party. One member offered to bake a cake. Several members also planned a surprise baby shower to be held at this meeting for one of the women who was expecting a baby. After the last meeting, one of the members wrote the agency and the church group expressing gratitude for making the meetings possible and anticipation of renewed meetings in the Fall.

The group developed interest in promoting more such meetings. The possibility of pub-

licity as a basis for obtaining money for more meetings was discussed with them. They were not only willing but anxious that this be done, and wanted their names used. They are proud to be part of this group.

The meetings have had social value for many of the members, especially for some husbands and wives who rarely, if ever, had shared an activity of mutual interest. Most of the members have benefited from the knowledge they have acquired and others have really been stimulated to examine their methods of handling their children and to look at themselves critically. They all seemed to be trying sincerely to be better parents. We think this most significant in light of the fact that they had come to the attention of a protective agency because of failure to meet the communities standards in caring for their children.

JANE McFERRAN

Supervisor, Protective Service Division,  
Jefferson County Welfare Department, Louisville, Ky.

Fees For Adoption Service

THE New Hampshire Children's Aid Society, in Manchester, which estimates the cost of adoption as approximately \$950, has developed a fee schedule based on a percentage of income. As is the practice by most agencies, in this agency, too, the fee can be cut back or waived in unusual circumstances.

Income	Present Scale	New Scale
Under \$3,000	\$125	Under \$90.00 (3%)
\$3,000-\$3,999	150	\$120-\$159.96 (4%)
4,000- 4,999	175	160- 199.96 "
5,000- 5,999	200	200- 239.96 "
6,000- 6,999	225	240- 279.96 "
7,000- 7,499	250	280- 299.96 "
7,500- 7,999	250	375- 399.95 (5%)
8,000- 8,999	275	400- 449.95 "
9,000- 9,999	300	450- 499.95 "
10,000-10,999	"	500- 549.95 "
11,000-11,999	"	550- 599.95 "
12,000-12,999	"	600- 649.95 "
13,000-13,999	"	650- 699.95 "
14,000-14,999	"	700- 749.95 "
15,000-15,999	"	750- 799.95 "
16,000-16,999	"	800- 849.95 "
17,000-17,999	"	850- 899.95 "
18,000-18,999	"	900- 949.95 "
19,000 and over	"	950

For people who are receiving a second or a third child, the fee is fifty percent of what it would be for a first child.

In the spring of this year the Minnesota legislature changed the law which had specifically prohibited the charging of fees for adoption. Now social agencies in Minnesota are permitted legally to charge fees for adoption up to \$300.

BOOK NOTES

Supervision in the Changing Field of Social Work, by Dr. Sidney S. Eisenberg. Jewish Family Service of Philadelphia in Association with the School of Social Work, University of Pennsylvania. 1956. 82 pp. \$2.00.

Dr. Eisenberg reviews present-day practice of supervision as it operates in a voluntary family service agency, in which practice is functionally oriented and whose staff members have had full professional training.

His book first deals with the historical development of social work practice in agencies offering service to clients for the solution of individual problems, examining our professional history in an effort to understand the emergence of supervision as a tool. Beginning with the Charity Organization movement and referring briefly to earlier developments in England, he describes the interrelationship of district case committee, paid worker and volunteer, seeing in the activity of the paid worker the first elements of present day supervision. He considers that the early case committee carried some aspects of supervision, but that the significance of its function declined gradually. There is considerable tribute paid to Zilpha Smith as a leader whose ideas of what supervision might ultimately be were considerably beyond others of her era. He identifies Mary Richmond with her, as another person who exemplified truly humanistic principles as the root of practice in the field:

"Mary Richmond . . . for instance acknowledged in *Social Diagnosis* the contribution of law, medicine, psychology, philosophy, history, sociology and of social work itself. Yet it is likely that this first major formulation . . . of a method in social work also contributed to the lag in the development of a purely individual helping process. *Social Diagnosis* . . . and its sociological thinking dominated the field of family social work until the 1930's."

In broad strokes Dr. Eisenberg describes the impact of psychiatric research, World War I, and the depression upon the field of



social work and concludes that the present age of world complexities is an age of anxiety which affects both client and worker.

The second portion of this book is devoted to a deliberate and definitive presentation of the methodology of supervision. The author states his point of view in an emphatic and orderly way. His delineation of supervisory method as it operates functionally and his conviction of the value of this approach are readily understandable. There is a clear analysis of the administrative value of the supervisor's job in relation to redefined policy to meet changing needs, as well as to carry out established policy.

For the worker, supervision serves several purposes. The supervisor becomes the vehicle through which the agency's experience with clients is transmitted to the worker. This provides the worker with the opportunity to use an accepted method. Furthermore, the supervisor provides the worker with an opportunity for personal help with the disciplinary struggle between original impulsive ways of helping and the agency's tested method. The supervisor also identifies for the worker his own progress in using agency method. Over and above these functions, in supervision he uses his knowledge of the processes by which other workers in the agency have learned. In this overall function with the worker the supervisor is important to the client also. Through his service, the worker is steadied to an increasingly consistent use of agency policy with the client.

It is well nigh impossible to detail the contents of this meaty volume. The author deals with the old dilemma and the recurrent anxieties about independence and over-dependence, and discusses whether or not workers with professional training need supervision ad infinitum.

Although Dr. Eisenberg focuses primarily on the practice of supervision in the functional agency, his excellent bibliography contains material setting forth a variety of points of view, is broad in scope, and suitably related to his subject.

MAUDE VON P. KEMP

*District Supervisor, Maine State Department of Health and Welfare, Augusta, Maine*

**Your Community Should Count . . . to 10**, prepared by the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association, 1957. Order from National Probation and Parole Association, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y. Single copy, no charge; to 100, 10¢ each; 101-350, 8¢ each; 351-750, 7¢ each; 751 or more, 5¢ each.

In this pamphlet experienced practicing judges have set forth simply and briefly the services they consider essential in any realistic program to deal effectively with delinquency in a community. The judges stress that these required services must be either available in the community or available to the community on a statewide or district basis.

**Strengthening Public Welfare Adoption Services**, by Edith S. Baxter, Frances D. Bellanca, Elma Kullman, Clara J. Swan. Order from Winford Oliphant, Director, Bureau of Child Welfare, New York State Department of Social Welfare, 112 State St., Albany, N. Y. 20 pp.

This pamphlet consists of four articles illustrating the methods by which the New York State Department of Social Welfare is assisting local public agencies to improve and extend their adoption programs. Reprinted from *CHILD WELFARE*, the booklet is without charge because the cost of printing was met from Federal Child Welfare Services funds granted to New York State through the Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

**Fads and Facts as the Bases of Child-Care Practices**, by Milton J. E. Senn, M.D. Play Schools Association, 41 W. 57th St., New York 19, N. Y. 1957. 6 pp. 15¢ per copy, 20-25 copies—10% discount, 25-50 copies—20% discount.

Parents and professional workers will find this review of child-development research and child care trends of great value. Based on a paper presented by Dr. Senn at the 1956 biennial conference of the Play Schools Association, the leaflet in its present form is a reprint from *Children*.

**Baby Sitting**, Interdepartmental Staff on Children and Youth. Order from Michigan Department of Health, Lansing, Michigan.

This booklet offers useful information to baby sitters, parents, and foster parents on the care of children of all ages. It briefly discusses such phases of the baby sitter's job as feeding, diapering, protecting children from accidents, and making them feel

secure and happy. At the end of each section is a list of additional reading material on the subject discussed.

It also contains suggestions to parents on how to cooperate with the sitter to provide for the child's health, safety and well-being.

## CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL OPENINGS

Classified personnel advertisements are inserted at the rate of 10 cents per word; boxed ads at \$6.50 per inch. minimum insertion, \$2.50. Deadline for acceptance or cancellation is eighth of month prior to month of publication; Ads listing box numbers or otherwise not identifying the agency are accepted only when accompanied by statement that person presently holding the job knows that the ad is being placed.

**CASEWORK SUPERVISOR**, professionally trained and experienced, needed in statewide institution offering care to school-age children. New cottage-type plant, rapidly advancing program, good personnel practices. Write Max E. Livingston, Supt., The Methodist Children's Home, P.O. Box 859, Selma, Ala.

**CHILD WELFARE WORKERS** in urban and rural Arizona. 1 year's graduate training required. Arizona Merit System, 1632 W. Adams, Phoenix, Ariz.

**CASEWORKERS** — Professionally trained, for private nonsectarian adoption agency. Salary range \$4800-\$5800. Write Katharine Nugent, Director of Casework, Infant of Prague Adoption Service, 640 Franklin St., Fresno, Calif.

**LOS ANGELES**—Openings for two caseworkers with graduate training in expanding family and child welfare agency—multiple services including marital counseling, unmarried parents, financial assistance, child placement in foster home care and group care, psychiatric consultation. Highly qualified supervision. Standard personnel practices. Opportunities for advancement. Salary \$4572-\$6384 depending on training and experience. Write: Rev. William J. Barry, Assistant Director, Catholic Welfare Bureau, 855 S. Figueroa St., Los Angeles 17, Calif.

**CASEWORKER II** in child placement agency. Service includes intensive casework with deeply troubled parents and children. Psychiatric consultation. Excellent personnel practices, Social Security, retirement, and health insurance. Requirements: Master's degree social work school and potential of being creative. Salary \$4572-\$5712. Clyde S. Pritchard, Executive Secretary, Children's Bureau of Los Angeles, 2824 Hyans St., Los Angeles 26, Calif.

**CHILD WELFARE SERVICES WORKERS** for fast-growing county in adoptions or child welfare work. Excellent supervision. \$4884-\$5796. 1 year's graduate work required. Health insurance, paid vacation, sick leave, other benefits. County Personnel, 236 Third St., San Bernardino, Calif.

**LOS ANGELES — CASEWORKERS II and III** (2) in parent-child guidance service to families with troubled boys between the ages of 6-18; psychiatric and psychological consultation available. Requirements: Master's degree social work school; Grade III—five years' experience following graduation preferred. Salary, Grade II — \$4572-\$5712; Grade III—\$5112-\$6384; five-step plan. Social Security and retirement, health insurance paid by agency. Milton L. Goldberg, Executive Director, Jewish Big Brothers Association, Room 366, 590 N. Vermont Ave., Los Angeles 4, Calif.

**CHILD WELFARE SERVICES WORKER**, \$417-\$460. Immediate openings in adoptions, child placement, and protective services for social workers with 1 year graduate social work. No experience necessary. High professional standards and advancement opportunities. Write now to County Civil Service, 403 Civic Center, San Diego, Calif.

**CASEWORKERS** in expanding family service program. Opportunity for male worker in developing outpost offices. Group counseling and direct work with children. Psychiatric and psychological consultation. Immediate openings. MSW required. Salary: I, \$4536; II, \$4764-\$5796; III, \$6074-\$6708. Additional income for after-hours interviews possible. Write Nevin Wiley, Family Service, 645 A St., San Diego, Calif.

**CHILD WELFARE WORKERS** (2). Requirements: MSW or 1 year's graduate training in accredited social work school and 1 year's recent experience in social casework. Salary \$406-\$495. Liberal vacation and other employee benefits under County Civil Service. Opportunity to work under qualified supervision in expanding child welfare program. Write Ventura County Department of Social Welfare, Court House, Ventura, Calif.

**CASEWORKER** professionally qualified for foster care or adoption program of Jewish Family and Child Service. High standards of practice, supervision and personnel code. Extensive student training program. Good opportunities for professional development. Good facilities in community for cultural and social expression. Salary range \$3450-\$4900. Apply Miss Dora Wilensky, Executive Director, Jewish Family and Child Service, 150 Beverley St., Toronto 2B, Ontario, Canada.

**COME TO COLORFUL COLORADO!** Immediate positions available for child welfare workers in CWLA and APWA agency. Salary range \$4020-\$5256. One year graduate training required. Excellent benefits, professional supervision, and unusual opportunity for development in well-rounded child welfare program. Write Personnel Officer, Denver Department of Welfare, 777 Cherokee, Denver, Colo.

**CASEWORKER**—Male, for small residential program in multiple-service child care agency. Good supervision, psychiatric consultation, good personnel practices. Requirements: complete professional training, some experience preferred. Salary \$3841-\$5530. Favorable location —70 minutes from New York City. Write Executive Director, Woodfield Children's Village, 1899 Stratfield Rd., Bridgeport 4, Conn.

**CASEWORKERS** in private, nonsectarian, statewide, multiple-function agency. Small case loads, excellent supervision, student training program, psychiatric consultation. Openings in Hartford in newly established Protective Service Unit, in child placing, in Residential Treatment Center, and in Adoption Department. Other openings in Torrington and Norwalk District Offices. Social Security and retirement. Requirements: Master's degree social work. Present salary scale \$4100-\$5600—January 1958 scale, \$4500-\$6600. Initial salary based on qualifications. C. Rollin Zane, Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut, 1680 Albany Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.

**GROUP WORK SUPERVISOR** in residential treatment center for children. General responsibility for all group activities. Specific responsibilities include supervision of houseparent, recreational and volunteer staffs. Psychiatric consultation. Requirements: MSW with group work sequence preferred. Salary range \$4700-\$5800 which will be increased January 1, 1958 to a range of \$5100-\$7050. Initial salary based on qualifications. Social Security and retirement. Miss Ruth H. Atchley, Resident Director, Children's Village, 1680 Albany Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.

**CASEWORKERS (2).** Graduate training for small Catholic agency within commuting distance of New York City. Immediate openings. Multiple services. Salary range \$4500-\$5000 depending on experience. Retirement and regular increments. Psychiatric consultation available. Apply Miss Mary C. Coughlin, Executive Secretary, Catholic Charities, 78 Elm St., Stamford, Conn.

**CASEWORKER** in family-children's service agency providing family casework, specialized services to unmarried mothers, child placement and adoption. Salary comparable with good practice. Social Security and retirement. Write Miss Jane K. Dewell, Executive Secretary, Catholic Social Service Bureau, 478 Orange St., New Haven, Conn.

**CASEWORKER** in multiple-function, private, nonsectarian, child welfare agency. Case load of emotionally disturbed children in institutional setting. Psychiatric consultation. Good personnel practices. Top salary limit \$5600. Minimum requirement: two years' graduate social work training. Complete details by writing Anna K. Buell, Casework Supervisor, Children's Center, 1400 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**—Well-established, private nonsectarian residential treatment center for emotionally disturbed children in suburb of Chicago. Member CWLA and Chicago Community Fund. Psychiatric consultants: Dr. Irene Josselyn and Dr. Harold Balikov. Excellent staff. Salary open. Write Mr. Arthur Rooney, Personnel Chairman, Ridge Farm, 40 E. Old Mill Rd., Lake Forest, Ill.

**CASEWORKER** — Institution for boys; MSW but no experience necessary. To work with parents and on admissions, chiefly in Chicago. Salary \$4000-\$4500. Write Director, Allendale School, Lake Villa, Ill.

**FLORIDA — ADOPTION HOMEFINDERS AND SUPERVISOR.** Positions in Jacksonville and Pensacola for fully-trained caseworkers and senior caseworkers with child placement experience which includes supervised experience in adoptive placement and adoptive homefinding. Senior and supervisory positions open to those with skill in developing program in community or special qualifications in adoptive homefinding. Agency is private statewide and work requires some travel in state hard to match for climate and beauty. Prepared to pay good salaries for staff who can offer the desired casework experience in child placing and adoptions. Let us know about you and write for information to Miss Cornelia Wallace, Children's Home Society of Florida, P.O. Box 5587, Jacksonville 7, Fla.

**SENIOR ADOPTION CASEWORKER** for special position starting demonstration program in fast-growing, progressive urban community in one of Florida's most desirable locations. Requires Master's degree and previous experience in child placement in recognized agencies, particularly in adoptive placement and adoptive homefinding. Position considered in same status as supervisor because of need for experienced caseworker skilled in community relations. Salary open, dependent on qualifications. Write Miss Cornelia Wallace, Children's Home Society of Florida, P.O. Box 5587, Jacksonville 7, Fla.

**CASEWORKERS**, medical and psychiatric, general hospital, excellent working conditions, liberal personnel policies, MSW required. State salary expected. Write Personnel Director, The Queen's Hospital, P.O. Box 614, Honolulu, Hawaii.

**CASEWORKERS, SUPERVISORS, GROUP WORKERS** for many multiple-function, church-related child care agencies; East, South, Middle West. Attractive salaries, personnel practices. Write Board of Hospitals and Homes of the Methodist Church, 740 Rush St., Chicago 11, Ill.

**ILLINOIS — SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS** for casework in public school settings; focus on children's social and emotional problems; positions open in communities throughout state; supervision in some districts; upon certification by State Consultant, selection of worker made by local school district. Requirements: MSW in social casework. Teacher certificate preferred but not necessary. Salary \$4000-\$6500 for school year of 9-10 months. Appointment salary dependent on local teachers' salary scale. Tenure and retirement plan same as teachers. Car allowance varies according to local regulations. John C. Nebo, State Consultant, Illinois Visiting Counselor Program, 400 S. Western Ave., Park Ridge, Ill.

**CASEWORKERS (2)** — Graduate training for Catholic agency serving families and children, counseling foster homes and adoptions. Write Catholic Charities, 830 E. Monroe St., Springfield, Ill.

**CASEWORK SUPERVISOR** — male preferred. Supervision of 2 caseworkers plus casework treatment with protected case load of boys in residence in institution. Former supervisory experience desired but not required. Applicant should have both institutional and foster home experience. Can appoint to \$5400. T. T. Mintun, Executive Director, Central Baptist Children's Home, Lake Villa, Ill.

**SUPERVISOR AND CASEWORKER** for small family and children's agency with good standards. MSW and 4 years' casework required for supervisor. MSW preferred for caseworker but will consider less training. Retirement plan. Social Security, generous vacations, 5-day week. Salary ranges being revised. Write Miss Luna E. Kenney, Family and Children's Service, 313 S. E. Second St., Evansville, Ind.

**CASEWORKER**, man or woman, in small, private, nonsectarian, multi-function children's agency offering institutional and foster home program; adoptions and services to unmarried mothers. Master's degree social work school. Excellent supervision and psychiatric consultation available. Starting salary \$4000-\$4500. Member CWLA. Social Security and National Retirement Plan. Write Executive Director, Children's Aid Society of Indiana, 1411 Lincoln Way West, Mishawaka, Ind.